

**GENTRY POLITICS OF SOUTHERN
ENGLAND, 1461-1485,
WITH REFERENCE TO THE CRISIS OF
OCTOBER 1483**

*Mary
Louise*

M. L. Gill B. A. (Hons)

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy**

University of Tasmania

(Hobart, 1992)

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university and, to the best of my knowledge, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Mr. S. R. U.

M. L. Gill

SUMMARY

Gentry Politics of Southern England, 1461-85, with Reference to the Crisis of October 1483

Louise Gill - University of Tasmania

The main concern of this thesis is to examine the gentry of southern England during the Yorkist period and to attempt to answer two basic questions: who were the rebel gentry and why did they rebel? - in the context of 'Buckingham's rebellion' of October 1483. Part 1, 'Sources and Interpretations' sets out the sources of our knowledge of the revolt, the limitations of the evidence, and what, over five hundred years, historians have made of the rising. The aim of Part 1 is to unravel the main facts, and to identify and resolve (provisionally at this stage) important points which are under dispute. Part 2, 'The Rebellion', introduces the disaffected areas in the South and the major landholders among the aristocracy. It introduces a sample of rebels and explores their power and patronage within the regions and at court, and the representative nature of the group as gentry leaders of southern society. In addition, Part 2 provides an assessment of the scale and seriousness of the rebellion. Part 3, 'Southern England in the Yorkist Polity' introduces the regions in the context of conflict and crises of government, 1459-61 and 1469-71, tracing patterns of gentry allegiance and activity through the period. It examines the regional restructuring of the early 1470s under Edward IV, and the period of consolidation, 1471-83. Part 4, 'Richard's Ruin', explores the conspiracies and rebellion in 1483; the patronage accorded the gentry by Richard III; the King's response to 'Buckingham's rebellion': patterns of support, patterns of punishment; the duke of Buckingham's own sedition; and finally the breakdown of Richard's rule. The dissertation concludes with five appendices: knights and squires of the body and household of Edward IV, 1461-1483; sheriffs and members of peace commission in the last years of Edward IV's reign; recipients of pardons, 1 February - 31 July 1484; peace commissions prior to the rebellion, June - September 1483; rebels of 1483.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
ABBREVIATIONS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1

PART 1 - SOURCES AND INTERPRETATIONS

Chapter 1	A Study of the Primary Sources	5
Chapter 2	Historiography	38

PART 2 - THE REBELLION

Prologue	The Regions of Revolt	80
Chapter 3	The Land, 1461-1485 : Kings, Nobles and Gentry	85
Chapter 4	The Rebels	
	(i) County Concerns, Regional Identity	121
	(ii) The Wider World: Contact with Court, Southern Society	140
	(iii) Service: Provenance and Profit	149
Chapter 5	The Size and Significance of 'Buckingham's Rebellion'	161

PART 3 - SOUTHERN ENGLAND IN THE YORKIST POLITY

Chapter 6	The Regions of Revolt, 1461-1483	196
Chapter 7	The Crown in Crisis - A Retrospective	205
Chapter 8	The Gentry - A Retrospective	
	(i) Conflict and Tensions to 1461: Patronage and Politics	218
	(ii) Crises and Rebellions, 1461-1471: Activity and Allegiance	230
Chapter 9	Consolidation, 1471 - 1483	242

PART 4 - RICHARD'S RUIN

Chapter 10	Continuity : Court and County, April - October 1483	257
Chapter 11	Dislocation : Court and County, November 1483 - August 1485	268
Chapter 12	Richard's Response : Patterns of Pardon, Patterns of Punishment	276
Chapter 13	'Buckingham's Rebellion'	288
Chapter 14	The Aftermath	307
CONCLUSION		313
APPENDICES		325
BIBLIOGRAPHY		368

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks must go to my supervisor Associate Professor M. J. Bennett, who first suggested 'Buckingham's rebellion' as a suitable topic for research, and who has provided invaluable counsel and guidance at all stages of my work. To the History Department, University of Tasmania, for making available its resources, and to the Higher Degrees Committee for its helpfulness in dealing with my problems and requests, I also extend my thanks.

I am indebted to numerous librarians and archivists both here and in England, who have assisted me in my research. Whether our dealings were in person or by correspondence all have been most generous with their time and patience. I am particularly grateful to the Inter-Library Loans staff at the Morris Miller Library for their help in obtaining numerous items from interstate and overseas.

To my fellow-students Em Underwood and Simon Harris, I owe special thanks; Em for her friendship and kindness, Simon for his generous help with the technical side of the preparation of this work.

Finally I owe most to Mark, Michelle and Simone, who have lived with 'Buckingham's rebellion' for what must seem an eternity, and whose support and encouragement throughout, I have found invaluable.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Ancient Deeds</i>	<i>A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office</i> , 6 vols (London, 1890-1915)
<i>Annals</i>	John Stow, <i>The Annales; Or General Chronicle of England begun first by Maister John Stow and after him Continued and Augmented with Matters Forreyne</i> (London 1615)
<i>Arrivall</i>	<i>Historie of the Arrivall of King Edward IV</i> , ed. J. Bruce, Camden Society (1838)
<i>B.I.H.R.</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</i>
<i>B.L.</i>	British Library, Reference Division
<i>B.L.H.M.</i>	<i>B.L. Harleian MS 433</i> , ed. R. E. Horrox and P. Hammond, 4 vols (Gloucester, 1979-83)
<i>C.C.R.</i>	<i>Calendar of the Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, 1399-1509</i> , 18 vols (London, 1927-63)
<i>C.I.P.M.</i>	<i>Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem...preserved in the Public Record Office, Henry VII</i> , 3 vols (London, 1898-1955).
<i>C.P.</i>	<i>The Complete Peerage</i> , ed. V. Gibbs, H.A. Doubleday etc., 13 vols (London, 1910-40)
<i>C.P.R.</i>	<i>Calendar of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, 1399-1509</i> , 17 vols (London, 1903-16)
<i>C.R.B.L.</i>	<i>Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 1470</i> , ed. J. G. Nichols, Camden Society (1847)
<i>The Crowland Chronicle Continuations</i>	
	<i>The Crowland Chronicle Continuations 1459-1486</i> , ed. N. Pronay and J. Cox (London, 1986)
<i>D.N.B.</i>	<i>The Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>E.H.R.</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>Extant Documents</i>	<i>The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents</i> , ed. A. F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond (Gloucester, 1983)
<i>The Great Chronicle of London</i>	
	<i>The Great Chronicle of London</i> , ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (London, 1938)
<i>Grants, Edward V</i>	<i>Grants etc. from the Crown during the Reign of Edward the Fifth</i> , ed. J. G. Nichols, Camden Society (1854)
<i>H.M.C.</i>	<i>Historical Manuscripts Commission</i> - publications

<i>Mancini</i>	<i>'Dominicus Mancinus Ad Catonem De Occupatione Regni per Ricardum Tercium Libellus'</i> , translated by C.A.J. Armstrong, <i>The Usurpation of Richard III</i> , 2nd edn (Oxford, 1969)
<i>Materials</i>	<i>Materials for the History of the Reign of Henry VII</i> , ed. W. Campbell, Rolls Series, 2 vols (London, 1873-7)
<i>Memorials</i>	W.E. Hampton, <i>Memorials of the Wars of the Roses</i> (London, 1979)
<i>Norfolk Household Books</i>	<i>Household Books of John duke of Norfolk and Thomas earl of Surrey 1481-1490</i> , ed. J. P. Collier (1844)
<i>Paston Letters</i>	<i>Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century</i> , ed. N. Davis, 2 vols (Oxford, 1971-76)
P.R.O.	Public Record Office
<i>Rot. Parl.</i>	<i>Rotuli Parliamentorum</i> , Vol. VI, 1472-1503 (London, 1783)
<i>Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes</i>	<i>Public Record Office Lists and Indexes No. IX: List of Sheriffs for England and Wales</i> (London, 1898)
<i>Stonor Letters</i>	<i>The Stonor Letters and Papers 1290-1483</i> , ed. C. L. Kingsford, 2 vols, Camden Society (1919)
<i>Trevelyan Papers</i>	<i>Trevelyan Papers Prior to A.D. 1558</i> , ed. J. P. Collier, Camden Society (1856-7)
T.R.H.S	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>
V.C.H.	Victoria County History
<i>Vergil</i>	<i>Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III</i> , ed. H. Ellis, Camden Society (1844)
<i>Warkworth</i>	J. Warkworth, <i>A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth</i> , ed. J. O. Halliwell, Camden Society (1839)
<i>Wedgwood</i>	J. C. Wedgwood, <i>History of Parliament: Biographies of the Members of the Commons House</i> (London, 1936)

INTRODUCTION

In October 1483 a series of risings, collectively known as 'Buckingham's rebellion', was planned across southern England against Richard III. According to the official indictment, the rebels sought to 'murder' and to 'utterly destroy' the King and to 'set up another...in his place'. The emotive language used by the crown invests the episode with a certain drama. Nevertheless, the aim of the rebels was, it seems, to replace Richard III with the Lancastrian exile, Henry Tudor, uniting him in marriage with Elizabeth of York, Edward IV's eldest daughter, thereby joining the houses of York and Lancaster.

On paper at least, the rising must have appeared sound. In terms of organisation and strategy there was much to commend it, with five main theatres of revolt, in south-east Wales, and at Exeter, Newbury, Salisbury and Kent. Rebels from the South East planned to take the capital and free the Queen and the Princesses from captivity. In the Central South, dissidents would group at Newbury and Salisbury, linking up with forces raised by the duke of Buckingham and the marquis of Dorset in Wales and the West, respectively. This 'might' was planned in support of Henry Tudor, set to land off the Devon coast at Plymouth, or further east at Poole in Dorset, around 18 October. Having raised the South, the rebels would then join forces and mount a major assault on London, the administrative heart of the kingdom; Richard III would be captured and overthrown, and Henry Tudor installed at Westminster as King Henry VII.

Despite its careful planning, however, the revolt had little chance of success. The Kentishmen gave the plot away when, impatient for action, they began to collect in an area of woodland over a week earlier than agreed. The quick response of the King's lieutenants in the South East ended the rebels' hopes of raising the region and taking the capital. Buckingham's forces - such as they were - were unable to cross the Severn, swollen by flood, while the effective strategies of Richard's allies, already alerted to trouble, scattered the insurgents and ended the duke's role. Within a day or so of Buckingham's defeat, the Central Southern sectors of Newbury and Salisbury crumbled before the royal host, as Richard sped down through the region and then west towards Exeter. Here the rebels fared no better. As the days passed and neither Henry Tudor nor Buckingham appeared, it was clear that the revolt had failed. The Exeter contingent dispersed, many falling back on Bodmin in Cornwall in a last ditch attempt to rally support, before they too took flight. Politically sound, but militarily weak, the revolt was crushed by Richard within three weeks.

'Buckingham's rebellion' capped perhaps the most eventful period in English political history. Soon after Edward IV's death on 9 April 1483, his brother, Richard, duke of Gloucester, dismantled the power-base of the former Queen's kin, the Woodvilles; was appointed Protector during his nephew's minority; smashed an alleged plot against his life; declared his nephews illegitimate and ineligible to succeed; and, in late June, appointed himself King. Throughout this activity, Henry, duke of Buckingham gave his unqualified support for which he received unprecedented rewards.

In the weeks which followed the coronation, events were no less dramatic. Intrigue and rumour in the counties and the capital had accompanied Richard's actions, and by mid-July, directives to local communities, commissions of inquiry, and executions at Westminster underlined the sedition. Men had already met to consider strategies to restore Edward's sons, and as Richard journeyed north in late July, he left in his wake, disaffection and doubt. Around this time the boys were widely believed dead, and through late summer groups in the counties, in the capital and at court discussed possible tactics to remove the new King. When Buckingham joined the conspirators in late August or early September, the plan for the rising was already established.

Rebellion against the crown was not new in Yorkist England. In the early 1460s men from the South West mounted campaigns against Edward IV, while more serious sedition in the South threatened the crown between 1469-71. In both instances the rebels, led by disgruntled nobles, had aimed at restoring the deposed Henry VI. During both periods of conflict, local magnates had been able to attract into their retinues a number of leading notables, powerful gentry whose interests were closely entwined with those of their lord. However the localised nature of the disaffection, and a roll-call of the rebels indicates its regional aspect and the unavoidable consequences, on occasion, of magnate rivalries on gentry politics. Conversely, the significance of the revolt against Richard III in 1483 lies in the absence of magnate dominance and the prominence of gentry leadership. The rising involved the most powerful knights and esquires in the South, from Kent through to Cornwall and including East Anglia. It comprised a substantial proportion of Edward IV's household; men, who, as regional powers with a tradition of service, were the link for the crown between court and county. In this context, the revolt was unprecedented in English history. Accordingly, the central theme of this work is 'Buckingham's rebellion'; and the two main questions posed: who were the rebel gentry, and why did they rebel?

The discussion is composed of fourteen chapters arranged in four parts. The first chapters are concerned with the evidence on, and interpretations of, the politics of 1483 with emphasis on the October rising. In terms of the primary source material, interest centres on the various

classes of official documents which best allow an insight into the crown's reaction to the revolt; private letters and papers which provide a window out to the attitudes of the wider community; and a critical examination of the chronicle sources for their insights on the events surrounding the rebellion. This is followed by a survey of the historiography of the period, which aims to unravel the topic and to explore and resolve conflicting interpretations of 1483 provided by over four centuries of historical writing; in addition developments and changes in literary style and academic concern are noted and their effect on interpretations of the rising, discussed. Part 2 aims to expose the gentry in the South: their history, wealth and status; their place within the greater aristocracy and their standing with the King. Simultaneously it is hoped that an examination of the power-structure within the South may disclose the framework which assisted the rebels in their revolt. In addition, a quantitative analysis of the rising in regard to numbers, extent and chronological pattern, is undertaken to assess its weight both in terms of its participants and its impact on the country. The political history of the South with regard to the regions and the rebels is the broad theme in Part 3. The discussion examines the activity and allegiance of the gentry during the conflict of 1461-1471 to elicit patterns of behaviour with which to compare and contrast - after twelve years of internal peace - their revolt in 1483. The final section highlights the treatment accorded the rebels under Richard between May-September 1483 as evidence of possible catalysts of revolt. The focus then shifts to the impact of the rising on King and country, including a survey of the political dislocation it created, Richard's reaction to the revolt, and the measures he adopted to counter its effects. In view of the role ascribed the duke in the earliest extant writing, and the title accorded the event late last century, Buckingham's own sedition will be examined. The last topic for discussion centres on the repercussions of the rising for Richard's reign. In an attempt to answer the questions posed by the topic, the discussion, in conclusion, will focus on the significance of the rising both in the reign of Richard III, and in the wider context of the Yorkist polity.

PART 1

SOURCES AND INTERPRETATIONS

CHAPTER 1

A STUDY OF THE PRIMARY SOURCES

Enjoying his northern progress after the coronation, in early October 1483 Richard III was relishing signs of loyalty in the North. He had felt disquiet on a number of occasions since the coronation, but perhaps at York he was able to forget the threat of disaffection and bask in the warmth of 'his own personal authority'.¹ It was at Lincoln, however, that any complacency the King enjoyed was shattered. On 11 October he received information from John Howard, duke of Norfolk that the Kentishmen had risen in the Weald. Since the subsequent Act of Attainder stressed 18 October as the date of general insurrection it has been generally assumed that the outbreak of the Kentish sector of 'Buckingham's rebellion' was premature. Over the following months he would remember this time as the beginning of his real anguish. For although he was able to quell the revolt within three weeks, the duke's rebellion heralded the start of Richard's downfall. Norfolk had been apprised of the rising on 8 October while touring his newly acquired Mowbray estates in Surrey and Sussex, where he learned that 'the Kentishmen be up in the weald'.² Immediately he wrote to the King, and set about organising clients such as John Paston in Norfolk whom he summoned to bring to London, 'six tall fellows in harness'.³

In order to set the context for 'Buckingham's rebellion' and its aftermath, it is proposed firstly, to explore the most contemporary material : the relevant records of departments of state, together with the York borough records and private correspondence. It is hoped that the material will highlight both the King's response to the rising and the repercussions which

1. P. M. Kendall, *Richard III* (London, 1955) pp. 252-3.

2. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 799. According to Norfolk in his letter to Paston, the Kentishmen 'say that they will come and rob the city', and it is clear that disturbances had already occurred. His expedition in notifying the King and organising help, Richard's subsequent action, and the detail on the sectors of revolt in the Act of Attainder leave little doubt that the men of the Weald had - in the first instance - given the plot away. See R. Horrox, *Richard III: A Study of Service* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 152, for her discussion on the possibility of Richard having had prior knowledge of Buckingham's disaffection.

3. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 799, for Norfolk's letter to John Paston; see also *Norfolk Household Books*, pp. 453-79; C. Ross, *Richard III* (London 1981), p. 116.

worried his rule. Next, problems associated with the remaining primary material will be addressed. Conflicting evidence and partisan accounts raise certain questions concerning the reliability of the primary sources, their access to information and their closeness to the events surrounding the rebellion of 1483. The following discussion will explore the likely authorship of the second continuation of the Crowland Chronicle and its implications for the reign of Richard III; assess the importance of the continental histories; look more closely at the writing of John Rous; attempt to unravel the history of the London Chronicles, not least the similarities and significance of 'The Great Chronicle' and 'Vitellius A XVI'; and finally focus on the nature of the role of Vergil and More in Tudor historical tradition - innovators or generators?

From three of the main sources of contemporary historical information - the official record material, local government records and private letters and family papers - it is possible to chart the course of events from the eve of 'Buckingham's rebellion' through to Richard's defeat at Bosworth. Of the official material, the Chancery records are the most valuable. While the Exchequer and King's Bench rolls yield some important details, the Chancery records shed most light on the King's response to the revolt, his military preparations, the punishment meted out to the rebels, as well as their pardons, and the patronage dispensed through his reign. They highlight the various disturbances during the period and Richard's growing concern over Henry Tudor and the ever-present threat of invasion. The relevant records comprise a wide range of material which passed under the great and privy seals and the signet, much of which is recorded in the patent, close and pardon rolls. However, one of the most important sets of records of Ricardian government is the collection of copies of documents which passed under the signet during the reigns of Edward V and Richard III known as British Library Harleian Manuscript 433.⁴ Third in importance behind the great and privy seals, the signet 'was the King's own seal, kept by his secretary, and used to authenticate documents originating with the King himself.'⁵

The most relevant information among local government records is found in the books containing the minutes of the proceedings of the York city council. Rather ironically the minutes record Richard's request for assistance from York on the eve of 'Buckingham's rebellion', when a few months earlier they had documented his plea for aid against the

4. *British Library, Harleian MS 433*, ed. R. Horrox and P. W. Hammond, 4 vols (London, 1979-83); 'British Library Harleian Manuscript 433', *The Ricardian*, Vol. V (1979), pp. 87-91; Ross, *op.cit.*, p. 170.

5. Ross, *op.cit.*; G.R. Elton, *England 1200-1640, The Sources of History: Studies in the Uses of Historical Evidence* (London, 1969), p. 34; J. Otway-Ruthven, *The King's Secretary and the Signet Office in the XV Century* (Cambridge, 1939), ch. 3, 'The Signet', *passim*.

Woodvilles who intended 'to murder, to utterly destroy his royal person' together with 'his cousin the duke of Buckingham'. Richard's final requests for help in the weeks before the battle of Bosworth, are also recorded.⁶

Private letters form a most important source of historical information because as Ross says 'they are usually contemporary, and unselfconscious'. One particular letter alleged to have been written by the duke of Buckingham to Henry Tudor on 24 September, 1483, would, if extant, provide irrefutable evidence of the duke's involvement in the revolt, by at least this date.⁷ In its absence, however, the relevant letter collections while rich in detail, provide, in the main, less dramatic, but verifiable information on the period in question. The family papers of the Stonors, Plumpton and Pastons, yield few political insights into national affairs; nevertheless, the news sent to Sir William Stonor from Simon Stallworth in London on events surrounding the death of William Lord Hastings in June, 1483, together with the calls for help from the duke of Norfolk to John Paston on the eve of revolt, and the Plumpton correspondence with its insight into northern reactions to the outbreak of Buckingham's rebellion, are invaluable.⁸

On 12 October 1483 with widespread revolt incipient, the King, at Lincoln, requested the great seal from the chancellor in London. Among other things this request signifies the 'weight' of Richard's intelligence as well as providing the first concrete evidence of his knowledge of the duke's disaffection. Bishop Russell was directed to relinquish the great seal, which was dispatched from the capital on 16 October, and accepted three days later at Grantham by Richard, at the Angel Inn.⁹ Before the King left Lincoln on 17 October, proclamations denouncing Buckingham had been issued on the 15th and published at York on the 16th and at Hull on 17 October.¹⁰ A second royal proclamation made at Leicester on the 23rd of the month was circulated to the sheriffs of Devon, Cornwall, Shropshire, Wiltshire and other southern

6. *Extracts from the Municipal Records of the City of York during the Reigns of Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III*, ed. R. Davies (London, 1843), introd. and pp. 152-3, 214-15; Elton, *op.cit.*, pp. 119-120.

7. For Buckingham's alleged letter to Henry Tudor see *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 245; see also appendices to documents in B. A. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, *Francois II, duc de Bretagne* (Paris, 1929) and J.L.A. Calmette and G. Perinelle, *Louis XI et l'Angleterre* (Paris, 1930).

8. *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, nos. 330, 331; *Paston Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 799; *Plumpton Correspondence*, pp. 44-5; Ross, *op.cit.*, pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

9. P.R.O., C81/1392/6; C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1171; H. Ellis, *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, 2nd. series, Vol. 1 (1824-26), p. 159; J. Gairdner, *History of the Life and Reign of Richard the Third*, (Cambridge, 1898), p. 130.

10. P.R.O., E404/78/2/4; B.L.H.M., Vol. 2, p. 30; Davies, *op.cit.*, pp. 179-80; Gairdner, *op.cit.*

counties. Denouncing Thomas, marquis of Dorset and several others 'who have assembled the people by the comfort of the great rebel the late Duke of Buckingham and the Bishops of Ely and Salisbury', a reward of £1000 or lands worth £100 was offered for the duke's capture together with 1000 marks or lands worth 100 marks a year for the marquis of Dorset and the Bishops of Ely and Salisbury, and for the knights, 500 marks or lands worth £40 a year. For 'all who withdrew from the rebels' cause' Richard gave 'his full and general pardon'.¹¹ Simultaneously, the first general commissions of array were formalised under the King's chamberlain, Francis, Viscount Lovell, to resist the leaders and their followers.¹² They were issued at Bridport on 5 November to the earl of Huntingdon and Sir James Tyrell for resistance in Wales ; to the earl of Surrey at Exeter three days later, to array the men of Kent and Sussex and to besiege the castle of Bodiam, held by the rebels ; and still at Exeter, on 13 November, to John, Lord Scrope of Bolton, to resist the rebels in the counties of Devon and Cornwall. This last appointment was accompanied by a commission of arrest in Devon, Cornwall, Somerset, Dorset, Southampton, Wiltshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire, while an inquisition was held three weeks later by Scrope, Peter Redmayn and Halneth Maleverer at Bodmin, Cornwall.¹³

Richard's immediate military preparations can also be traced through documents of state, borough records and family correspondence. He had stayed five or six days at Lincoln during which time he collected news on the rebels and the extent of opposition, as well as mustering his own forces before beginning the journey south. By October, a number of lords who had accompanied the King to York had dispersed to their family estates. Among his retinue were, in addition to Lord Scrope and Viscount Lovell, Lord Zouche and Thomas, Lord Stanley. To augment his following, Richard, however, despatched letters to York and Lancashire on 11

11. C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 370-1; T. Rymer, *Foedera, Conventiones, Literae...et Acta Publica* (etc), Vol. 12, p. 204; J. Ramsay, *Lancaster and York* (Oxford, 1892), Vol. 2, p. 506; Kendall, *op.cit.*, p. 271; K. Dockray, *Richard III: A Reader in History* (Gloucester, 1988), p. 105. See R. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 155, for her comment that as late as 23 October, Richard was unaware of rebellion in the South West. However the King's proclamation issued on the 23rd and circulated to the sheriffs in the relevant counties includes both Devon and Cornwall.

12. C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 370-1.

13. Royal Institution of Cornwall, BV. 1/4. The document which came to light late last century, was found among papers belonging to the Cornish family of Borlase. The inquisition was first mentioned in 1888, in W. C. Borlase, *The Descent, Name and Arms of Borlase of Borlase* (London, 1888), pp. 14, 29-30, and more recently by A.L. Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall* (London, 1969), p. 111, n. 3; see also Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 156, n. 70, and I. Arthurson and N. Kingwell, 'The Proclamation of Henry Tudor as King of England, 3 November 1483', *Historical Research*, Vol. 63, No. 150 (1990), pp. 100-6.

October summoning assistance.¹⁴ Aid was sought from solid gentry able to field private retinues such as Sir William Stonor in Oxfordshire, who was approached by Lovell on the same day.¹⁵ It was supplied by lesser men such as John Belle, bailiff of Cambridge, who 'came to our highness with four men defensibly arrayed' and who at his 'great cost labour and charge', waited 'upon us all our journey in repressing of our rebels and traitors unto the time we came to our city of London'.¹⁶ Norfolk was busy fortifying the capital and advising the council at Westminster, having delegated authority to Lord Cobham, Sir John Middleton and Sir John Norbury, whose force of around 100 men occupied Gravesend in Kent and held the passage across the Thames.¹⁷ In the North West both Buckingham and the King sought assistance from Lord Strange, Stanley's son, who was to leave Lathom around 20 October with '10,000' men, 'whither we cannot say'.¹⁸ As with the other requests, the contingents were to meet the King at Leicester on 20 October,¹⁹ while a company from the distant town of Southampton, circularized on the 13th for a 'body of horse', was to join the royal muster at Coventry on 22 October.²⁰ Arriving at Grantham on the 19th, the royal party proceeded to Leicester where the King was met the next day by his northern levies including 300 York men under the command of Thomas Wrangwysh.²¹

Richard's swift reaction to 'Buckingham's rebellion' was matched by his speed in declaring forfeit the leading rebels' lands, even before an Act of Attainder had been drawn up to ratify the procedure. The forfeitures are listed in the Harley Manuscript 433 which illuminates not only the King's response to the rising but his personal involvement in the rebels' punishment.²² The four Acts of Attainder passed in Richard III's first session of parliament in January and

14. Davies, *op.cit.*, p. 177.

15. P.R.O., SC1/46/102; *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 333.

16. P.R.O., E404/78/2/24. This is perhaps the John Belle of Letherhead, Surrey, cofferer of the household, escheator and former clerk of treasurer under John Eltrington; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 44, 175. See also Appendix III, for Belle's namesake.

17. *Norfolk Household Books*, p. 471; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 70,199,344,346; other royal servants sent by Norfolk into Kent, include Wotton, Nortriche, Passe, Richmond, Cartmail, Leader, Danyell, Scropham, Dobson and Middleton; see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 161, n. 89.

18. *Plumpton Correspondence*, pp. 44-5. Although Strange commanded a large retinue, this must be an exaggeration.

19. *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 1171. See Lovell's letter to Stonor in which this date is given for the general muster of troops.

20. *H.M.C.*, Eleventh Report, App. pt III, 103.

21. Kendall, *op.cit.*, p. 271.

22. For example, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 31-2,39-40,43,54-6,59-60; see also Ross, *op.cit.*, p. 119; B.P. Wolfe, *The Royal Demesne in English History* (London, 1971), pp. 192-3.

February 1484, were, in a sense, just a formality (the charge of treason and subsequent forfeiture, having already passed under the signet and having been acted upon), parliament having been persuaded 'to legalize the King's arbitrary procedures'.²³ The lateness of the Act of Attainder and its corollary, the issuing of pardons, highlight some interesting points for later discussion. For the present, the act emphasises the value of the Rolls of Parliament as a source in providing the names of the attainted rebels, a record of the crown's response to the revolt, and insights into the King's own reaction to Buckingham's betrayal. The 'Rolls' also contain Richard's allegation against Buckingham for inviting Henry Tudor to invade England on 24 September, and for stirring rebellion in each of the sectors mentioned.²⁴

On 23 October Richard issued a general pardon to the rank and file, and at least fourteen of the proscribed sued for pardons early in 1484, those who could lobby for support from influential friends close to the King.²⁵ The Pardon Rolls thus have a value in revealing the names of many lords, knights, esquires and others, who could well have been involved in sedition. Whatever else, the sheer volume of pardons indicates the impact of 'Buckingham's rebellion' on the country. It reflects the unease of the monarch as perceived by the community, and the fact that in a period of uncertainty it was deemed wise to take out a form of insurance, to protect oneself 'against the flames of royal persecution'. Doubtless it was also a period in which people could be wrongly indicted, and accordingly, lords and gentry alike sought a royal pardon as protection against their enemies.²⁶ In addition, the numerous petitions recorded in

23. *Rot. Parl.*, pp. 244-51; Ross, *op.cit.*, for quotation; for analysis of attainders, S. B. Chrimes, *Henry VII* (London, 1972), pp. 328-29.

24. *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, pp. 244-51; see above, p. 4. In general see G. R. Elton, 'The Rolls of Parliament 1449-1547', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (1979), pp. 1-29.

25. It is quite possible that Norfolk or Surrey intervened on behalf of the Wingfields and others of the East Anglian contingent. Both father and son were pardoned in February 1484, and on 27 February, John Wingfield esquire was acting with John, duke of Norfolk, William, earl of Nottingham, Thomas, Lord Stanley, and George Nevill, Lord Bergavenny. Norfolk was commanded to deliver John Norris, brother of rebel Sir William, to the King on 10 February, yet he too, received a pardon soon after. See *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 117; *ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 91, 110. See also M. Sayer, 'Norfolk involvement in Dynastic Conflict, 1467-1471 and 1483-1487', *Norfolk Archaeology*, Vol. 36 (1977), for connections between the Norfolk gentry and the dukes of Norfolk.

26. P.R.O., C67/51/M1; for quotation, I. Arthurson, 'The rising of 1497: A Revolt of the Peasantry?' *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. J. Rosenthal and C. Richmond (Gloucester, 1987), p. 11. This period was conducive to those with grudges who sought retribution, facilitated no doubt by Richard's proclamation in Kent following the rising that 'every

the rolls focus attention on the procedure for pardon of both the petitioners and the crown, in relation to those formally indicted, and those seeking to re-establish their position after the rising.

In relation to the size of the revolt, both the Act of Attainder and the Pardon Rolls have their limitations. Clearly the act names only the leading rebels, while the Pardon Rolls, which implicate (at least) many more, cannot wholly be taken at face value. However the names of other rebels are provided in the commissions of arrest instituted after the rising, and in the extant indictments, two of which were taken before the King's lieutenant, Lord Scrope of Bolton, at Torrington (Devon) and Bodmin (Cornwall). As apparently the only surviving indictments, they are of special interest, not least because of the probability of similar commissions in the other theatres of revolt. Although many of these men avoided attainder, a number forfeited goods and offices, and remained in eclipse until the end of the reign. Richard's retribution reflected his mood; at Bodmin the ringleaders were among the most powerful gentry in the land, and with many others had 'arrayed' in order to 'overthrow' and to 'utterly destroy the king', allegedly 'by the command and order of Henry, duke of Buckingham'.²⁷ The charge by the crown against the duke highlights an interesting possibility. Buckingham as constable of England (a position he had held since July, 1483) was empowered to take control of the government in the event of a crisis such as the King being incapacitated or killed, or, alternatively, if his power was held to be tyrannical. In view of the aristocratic rising against Richard III, and the charge against Buckingham made by the King's officers in November, it is, perhaps, conceivable that Buckingham had taken upon himself just such a role in October.²⁸

The Harley Manuscript 433 documents Richard's hurried disposal of forfeited estates to trusted servants, and those whose loyalty he sought to secure. At Salisbury on 2 November, the day of Buckingham's execution, the King granted Thomas, Lord Stanley 'the rule, guidance, and governance' of the duke's lordship of Kimbolton in Huntingdonshire.²⁹ Even before Richard left Exeter, Buckingham's lordship of Thornbury was granted to his brother, Sir William Stanley,

person...that finds himself grieved, oppressed or unlawfully wronged', should 'make a bill of complaint and put it to his highness, and he shall be heard and...have such convenient remedy as shall accord with his laws...': *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 49.

27. The indictment states that the rebels had unlawfully arrayed 'per mandatum....Henry duke of Buckingham'. For the indictment at Torrington, see J. Hooker, *Description of the City of Exceter*, ed. W. J. Hart and others, Devon and Cornwall Record Society (1919), Vol. 11, Part 2, pp. 53-4.

28. See J. G. Bellamy, *The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 160, 170-71.

29. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 30.

'for the good service he has done and shall do',³⁰ while estates of leading rebels such as knights John Fogge, George Brown and Robert Willoughby were granted to Sir Ralph Ashton, Edward Radcliffe and other of Richard's servants.³¹ Richard's disquiet is captured in his order to seize all the lands and goods of *all* household men and gentry in Wiltshire and Hampshire.³² And his fear of further trouble is noted in a number of orders to officers in the various counties in the weeks following the rebellion, to prevent the wearing of liveries.³³ Men were ordered to swear an oath of allegiance to Richard, and civil disturbance from servants and tenants of the rebels was clearly expected, particularly in the South East.³⁴ The King's worries were compounded by his constant fear of an invasion by Henry Tudor. This is implicit in many of his orders, and in the institution of a number of commissions of enquiry and array.³⁵ On tenterhooks from December 1484, the King ordered a general muster on 22 June 1485, and was, at Nottingham, well-placed for effective response to Henry Tudor's invasion.

While the official material and private papers cited are both trustworthy and chronologically close to the events they record, it is to the chronicles that students return, and to the *Crowland Chronicle* in particular, because the author's political observations, sharpened by his brevity, give his work a credibility which is lacking in some of the other near-contemporary sources. Special attention is paid to the chronicle for its informed comments on the Tudor threat, from the Spring of 1484 until the realization of Henry Tudor's bid on 22 August 1485.³⁶ While emphasising this particular aspect of Ricardian history, the chronicler

30. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 34.

31. *Ibid*; Ross, *op.cit.*, p. 119, and in general, Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 182 ff; for instance William Harrington obtained Calehill, Sir Edward Stanley, Rolvenden, and John Savage, Nettlestead, belonging formerly to John Darell, John Guildford and Nicholas Pympe, respectively. Sir Charles Pilkington received Hertshulle and Hauseley in Warwickshire, held by Alexander Culpepper, and Knesdale, Nottinghamshire, formerly Buckingham's manor. William Malyverer had licence to enter into the Kentish lands of Stephen Gerard and the late George Brown; in Cornwall, Edward Redman, Geoffrey Swale and Henry a Chamber, most probably all Yorkshire men, gave Richard Edgecombe's manor of 'Cothele' as their address: *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 196.

32. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 32; see also Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 181.

33. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 44-45, 69.

34. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 75-77, 81-83, 107, 208; clearly the tenants and servants from the Kentish estates of the Guildfords, John Fogge, John Darell, the deceased George Brown and Henry, duke of Buckingham, were proving troublesome to their northern lords.

35. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 182-3, 185, 228; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, pp. 124-6.

36. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, pp. 171, 173, 177, 179, 181, 183.

is terse on many important events - yet his work remains the most important historical source for the period.

Since its discovery, historians have hotly debated the likely authorship of the 'second continuation', and while a definitive result seems unlikely, strong evidence suggests that it was John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, or a member of his staff.³⁷ In recent years, scholars including A.R. Myers, P.M. Kendall, A. Hanham and C. Ross have cogently argued in favour of Russell's authorship, and certainly the pieces seem to fit well together. John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, councillor, secondary of the privy seal office 1469-74, keeper of the privy seal 1473-83, and chancellor of England, June 1483 - July 1485, was an educated and informed man who was doubtless on the inside of events during the period.³⁸

First mentioned as a royal councillor in 1467, Russell was sent abroad in this year, in 1471 and 1474 to treat with Charles, duke of Burgundy.³⁹ Clearly an eye-witness to some of the events he describes, the continuator on his mission to Charles in 1474 writes: 'You might have

37. Writing in 1913, C. L. Kingsford argued that the 'second continuation' was written at Crowland Abbey by one man over ten days in April 1486; its author was a doctor of canon law and a councillor of Edward IV who had been sent on a diplomatic mission to Charles the Bold in the summer of 1471. Dismissing C. Markham's claim of dual authorship by monks (one worldly, the other, unworldly) Kingsford assumed that the work had been undertaken by an ambassador who subsequently entered the monastery at Crowland. J. G. Edwards argued that the history was not necessarily written in ten days at Crowland Abbey, or that the author was a councillor of Edward IV. See Kingsford, *op.cit.*, pp. 180-81; C. Markham, *Richard III, His Life and Character* (London, 1906), pp. 175-9; J. G. Edwards, "The 'Second Continuation of the Crowland Chronicle: Was it written in Ten Days'?", *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. 39, No. 100 (1966), p. 118.

38. See A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge, 1963), Vol. 1, pp. 1609-11, for full biographical details. The continuator possesses sound knowledge of chancery and was, as Ross says, present at some meetings of council, parliament and convocation. His opinions are informed and his political judgements, astute. Moreover, Edwards himself claimed that Russell was at Crowland in April 1486, 'in the course of an episcopal visitation'. A. Hanham suggests that the Crowland Abbey came to possess a copy of Russell's manuscript 'probably through the abbey's connection with some member of the bishop's staff'. However it is more likely that Russell having completed his writing during the specified time, left his manuscript at the abbey where it came into the possession of the later redactor. See A. Hanham, *Richard III and his early Historians* (Oxford, 1975), p. 96.

39. J. R. Lander, 'Council, Administration and Councillors, 1461-1485', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXII (1959), p. 151.

seen certain of our party highly elated...'and, later on this same expedition, '...a suggestion reached us...'40 As both Ross and Hanham note the author wryly describes fashions at Edward's court in 1482, and at Richard's in 1484. He might well have been both at Edward's death-bed and the King's executor. Thus he writes perceptively:

he was...the most penitent of men for all his sins. Those who were present at the time of his death bear witness to this ...especially those whom he left as executors of his last will.⁴¹

Significantly, Bishop Russell was Edward's executor and also played a role in his funeral ceremonies.⁴²

The chronicler, curt on matters throughout May - November 1483, supplies just enough information to confirm the belief that he was at the centre of events during this time. Most likely he was one of the councillors who remained with the Queen at Westminster after Edward's death and debated the number of men deemed fit to ride with the young King to London.⁴³ So too, the writer had intimate knowledge of the proceedings of the council meeting on 10 May when a discussion took place regarding the King's residence:

Some suggested the Hospital of St John, some Westminster, but the duke of Buckingham suggested the Tower of London and his opinion was accepted verbally by all, even those who did not wish it.⁴⁴

His words suggest that he was among those who accompanied Thomas Bourghier, archbishop of Canterbury, to Westminster on 16 June 'to appeal to the good feelings of the Queen and prompt her...to give up the duke of York from sanctuary'. To which plan she agreed, 'assenting with many thanks to this proposal'.⁴⁵ Simon Stallworth's letter to Sir William Stonor on 21 June mentions that the chancellor was indeed with the archbishop on this occasion.⁴⁶ With inside information the writer notes that all knew who was the 'sole mover' in

40 *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 135.

41 *Ibid.*, p. 151.

42. *Memorials*, no. 170.

43. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 153.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 157.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 159.

46. *Stonor Letters*, no. 331. Stallworth was a member of Russell's staff. His informed comments to Stonor on the crucial events of June 1483 were doubtless obtained from his lord.

London behind the petition to Richard to ascend the throne, ostensibly thought up in the north.⁴⁷

Demonstrably the evidence points to Russell, or one of his own associates as the 'second continuator'.⁴⁸ In this context H.A. Kelly has suggested Dr Richard Lavender, Russell's second-in-command. N. Pronay and J. Cox favour Dr Henry Sharp, although they caution that the case 'should not be overstated'.⁴⁹ Whoever he was, the continuator provided a reliable source of information on diplomatic and financial dealings, possessed sound political expertise and was clearly involved in the politics of the period.⁵⁰

The Crowland Chronicle is of special interest to those studying the rebellion of 1483. Here the continuator, unlike the other primary sources, treats the revolt as a gentry movement whose motivation was quite independent of those involved in the machinations at the centre.⁵¹ The author mentions the discontent of the people in the southern and western parts of the kingdom, later he accurately names those counties involved: 'Kent, Essex, Sussex, Hampshire, Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, Wiltshire and Berkshire as well as some others of the southern

47. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 161.

48. From the evidence, it is reasonable to assume that the second continuator was a councillor both for Edward IV and Richard III. A study of the overlap of ecclesiastics, doctors of canon law, who served both Kings as councillors is instructive. Those ecclesiastics who were mentioned as councillors as early as 1471 and who served Richard are - John Alcock, bishop of Rochester (1471), Worcester (1476-), Ely, (1486); Thomas Bourghier, archbishop of Canterbury (1454-86); Thomas Rotherham, bishop of Rochester (1468), Lincoln, (1472-), archbishop of York (1480-1500); John Russell, bishop of Rochester (1476-), Lincoln (1480-94); and Robert Stillington, bishop of Bath and Wells (1466-91). Of this group the lawyers were John Alcock, John Russell and Robert Stillington, which rules out Thomas Bourghier and Thomas Rotherham. Alcock and Stillington are also cancelled out. The continuator refers to Stillington in the context of the parliament of 1473 as a man who 'did nothing except through his pupil, John Alcock, bishop of Worcester'. Clearly Robert Stillington was not the author; nor does it seem likely that Alcock would have expressed this candid view of himself in relation to his patron. See Lander, *op.cit.*, pp. 169-79 for details; see also R. J. Knecht, 'The Episcopate and the Wars of the Roses', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, Vol. 6 (1958), p. 109; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 133.

49. See H. A. Kelly, 'The Last Chroniclers of Croyland', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VII, No. 91 (1985), p. 162; 'The Riddle of Authorship', introd. to *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, pp. 90-95.

50. See Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), Appendix, for the author's reliability in these areas.

51. See in particular Vergil's account of the rebellion.

counties...⁵²Two points are striking: no other contemporary account gives as much information, and as a corollary, no other account displays the same bureaucratic thoroughness of the listing. Clearly this information had been well publicised by the time the history was set down. However the continuator's understanding of the gentry movement indicates perhaps, his own interest in the recent events. Kelly describes Russell as a supporter of Richard III.⁵³ Yet this is open to question. Much has been made of John Rous's comment that Russell accepted the office of chancellor with reluctance on May 10 after Rotherham's dismissal. Stallworth's letter to Sir William Stonor on 21 June in which he states: 'My lord [chancellor] has much business and more than he is content with, if any other way would be taken ...',⁵⁴ suggests, perhaps, that Russell was a reluctant chancellor during these months. His reluctance in office is understandable. The Bishop had been appointed as an advisor to the young King, and as a councillor he shared responsibility for the appointment of Richard as Protector. He had been a member of the divided council at Westminster when Hastings was executed and had attended Westminster to obtain the duke of York - ostensibly to attend his brother's coronation. As A. Hanham notes, most probably Russell was 'forced to acquiesce in, and indeed lend official countenance to, Richard's coup'.⁵⁵

There is some evidence to suggest that Richard III, if not aware of Russell's unease, had his own reasons for disquiet. Russell was relieved of the great seal on two occasions - both at times of incipient rebellion. Thus on learning of 'Buckingham's rebellion' on 11 October, the King sent the next day for the great seal. Despite the postscript with its emotional diatribe against Buckingham, there is an emphasis on the need for haste: 'we pray you not to fail...[but] to send our seal incontinent upon the sight hereof'. Historians have made light of Russell's surrender of the great seal in October 1483, yet his plea of illness which allegedly prevented him from delivering the seal in person, could well have been a ruse to delay relinquishing it. The chancellor's doggedness, if that was the case, was overcome, however, by the King's determination. And if Russell were 'dragging his feet', as R. Horrox suggests, Richard's postscript with his declaration of easy victory over the rebels, was no doubt intended as a veiled threat.⁵⁶ Whatever else, it may reveal the King's mistrust of one of his principal advisors; and it could well be that the insight which the second continuator brought to his work was fuelled by personal antipathy toward the key figures and the period in general. This

52. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 163.

53. Kelly, *op.cit.*, p. 156.

54. *Stonor Letters*, no. 331.

55. Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 95.

56. P.R.O., C81/1392/1. See also *Richard III: The Road to Bosworth Field*, ed. A. F. Sutton, P. W. Hammond (London, 1985), p. 125; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 152.

notwithstanding, the Crowland Chronicle appears an informed, if circumspect source for the events surrounding the rebellion.

Lacking the continuator's sophistication and subtlety, John Rous's *Historia Regum Angliae*, compiled around 1490, still contains some noteworthy snippets for the period in question. Largely dismissed by historians as 'a rag-bag of gleanings',⁵⁷ Rous, who was committed to the earls of Warwick (Beauchamp, Neville and then Richard, in right of his wife) writes favourably of the King during Richard's lifetime, yet his comments become caustic on Henry VII's accession. His history is discursive: interspersed are Russell's appointment as chancellor; the ballad of Anthony Earl Rivers; the removal from office, imprisonment and death of Rivers, Grey and Vaughan; a colourful description of Richard's deformities; the translation of Edward V's wealth to the duke of Buckingham; Richard's coronation; and his journey northward. According to Rous, Richard 'received his lord King' Edward V indifferently - then killed him along with his brother some three months later. He poisoned his wife and locked up his mother-in-law - these last three acts before the execution of Hastings and Richard's coronation.⁵⁸ Yet Rous, while muddling many of the facts, was able to comment with first hand experience on Richard's journey which took him through Warwickshire in August 1483. A chantry priest in that county, he had knowledge of Richard's progress at the time, describing ambassadors received by the King. His change of tone towards Richard on Henry VII's accession is understandable, especially if his loyalty was to Richard's wife, the Neville heiress. In fact it may be that Rous had become disaffected in March 1485 after the death of Queen Anne. If nothing else, his work, as one of the few primary sources for the period may be compared with the other narratives, and while terse and discursive, is still too important to be dismissed out of hand.

Rous's charge against Richard for the murder of his nephews had already been mentioned in a number of continental sources.⁵⁹ Most noteworthy is Dominic Mancini's charge against the

57. Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 106.

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 106-7, 118-124. While Rous's Warwick connection influenced his about-face after Richard's death, he was further disposed to such writing after the dowager duchess of Warwick made Henry VII her heir in July, 1487; see M. J. Bennett, *Lambert Simnel and the Battle of Stoke* (Gloucester, 1987), p. 108.

59. The Crowland Chronicler had mentioned 'a rumour which spread presumably after Buckingham retired to Brecon in early August that 'the princes, by some unknown manner of violent destruction, had met their fate'; recorder of Bristol, Robert Ricart was less cautious; Ricart wrote in his *Kalendar* for the year ending 15 September 1483, that 'in this year the two sons of King Edward were put to silence in the Tower of London'; see R. Ricart, *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar*, ed. L.

King in his work *The Usurpation of Richard III*, which was completed by early December 1483. In England until shortly after Richard's coronation on 6 July, Mancini, stopping short of a verbal accusation, nevertheless implicates him in the boys' death. After Hastings' execution, Edward V's servants 'were debarred access to him'; the boys 'were withdrawn into the inner apartments of the Tower...and...began to be seen more rarely...till at length they ceased to appear altogether...I have seen many men burst forth into tears and lamentations...and already there was a suspicion that they had been done away with'. The accusation is echoed in a speech made to the States-General of France at Tours in January, 1484, by Guillaume de Rochefort, Chancellor of France. A learned man, of 'staid' personality, his indictment of Richard derived from 'special intelligence', was 'an amazing outburst for an official allocution'; and all the more so, coming during Richard's reign and just months after the boys' disappearance.⁶⁰ The charge is also repeated in three other foreign sources soon after Richard's death. The first is in a letter written by Mosen Diego de Valera to the Catholic Monarchs of Castile and Aragon on 1 March, 1486. His source of information was a group of 'trustworthy merchants' who had arrived at Puerto de Santa Maria, de Valera's main residence from 1470.⁶¹ In allegorical fashion de Valera, citing a quotation from Psalms, writes:

I beheld the evil man exalted as the cedars in Lebanon; I passed by and lo, he was not; I sought him and he was not found in his place, for it is sufficiently well known to Your Royal Majesty that this Richard killed two innocent nephews of his to whom the realm belonged after his brother's life.⁶²

Next, French historian, Philippe de Commines, who apparently wrote his *Memoirs* for Angelo Cato (Mancini's patron) between 1489-91, describes Richard, 'who took control of the government for his nephew'... and 'did homage to him as King', as the man responsible for their deaths. For 'the duke had his two nephews murdered and made himself King'.⁶³ Finally, Jean

Toulmin Smith, Camden Society, New Series, Vol. V (1872), p. 46; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 163.

60. Mancini's work captured the attention of English historians in 1936 when it appeared in an edition by C. A. J. Armstrong. It is likely that Mancini was in England from the summer of 1482 until shortly after Richard's coronation on 6 July 1483, at the behest of his patron, Angelo Cato, archbishop of Vienne: Mancini, pp. 22-3, 93; Ross, *Richard III*, p. 100.

61. Goodman and Mackay, *op.cit.*, pp. 93-4.

62. E. M. Nokes & G. Wheeler, 'A Spanish Account of the Battle of Bosworth', *The Ricardian*, Vol. 2, No. 36 (1972), pp. 1-2.

63. Philippe de Commines, *Memoirs: The Reign of Louis XI, 1461-83*, ed. M. Jones (Middlesex, 1972), pp. 26, 35, 353-4.

Molinet, Burgundian man-of-letters, wrote that Richard, who 'had found means by accusations...to get rid of the Lord Scales, kinsman of the said children, Lord Rivers and Thomas Vaughan', imprisoned the Princes in the Tower, 'for five weeks thereabouts. The duke Richard [then] secretly had them killed by the captain of the Tower'.⁶⁴

It is, of course, significant that all three were writing after 1485, yet neither de Valera, Commynes, nor Molinet can easily be charged with Tudor partisanship. De Valera, writing early in 1486, had no motive 'for distorting the events' of 1483. Indeed this opinion of Richard reflects the view entertained by people both in England and Spain, and this 'just six months after the King's death', surely too soon for it to have been tampered with by Henry Tudor.⁶⁵ Neither Commynes, despite his chequered career at the French court, nor Molinet sought to propagate the rumour concerning the dead King (although Commynes may have been influenced by Mancini's account of 1483). Writing the relevant sections of their histories c.1490, these historians, like Mancini (chronologically most noteworthy of all) and de Valera, simply mirrored the view of Richard in his own time, both in England and abroad.

Interestingly, both Commynes and Molinet refer to 'duke Richard' as opposed to 'King Richard', having ordered the death of the Princes, according to Molinet, after they had been imprisoned 'for five weeks thereabouts'. If this date were taken from the day on which Edward V apparently first entered the Tower of London on 19 May 1483, then they were executed on or around 22 June, and four days before Richard became King. C. Richmond has recently published a note on 'The Death of Edward V', based on an entry in the Anlaby Cartulary.⁶⁶ This document was acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1932 and features in an article by M.R. James in 1934, in which he details a number of entries made in a table of years. Of particular interest is an entry made against the year 1483:

ti o

64. *Chroniques de Jean Molinet*, ed. G. D. Doutrepoint, O. Jodogne (Brussels, 1935-7), p. 431.

65. Goodman and Mackay, *op.cit.*, p. 98.

66. C.F. Richmond, 'Notes and Documents: The Death of Edward V', *Northern History*, Vol. XXV (1989), pp. 278-80. Two other continental sources also make the point: Caspar Weinreich of Danzig, in a near-contemporary report, and Jan Allertz, recorder of Rotterdam (d. 1489). See L. Visser-Fuchs, 'English Events in Caspar Weinreich's Danzig Chronicle', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII (1986), pp. 317, 320, n.28; see also A. J. Pollard, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower* (Gloucester, 1991), p. 122 and S. J. Gunn, 'Early Tudor Dates for the Death of Edward V', *Northern History*, Vol. XXVIII (1992), pp. 213-216.

ij menses et viij dies set non coronatus fuit
occisus et nemo s[c]it ubi sepultus

The hand is apparently not that of the compiler of the cartulary, Master Thomas Anlaby who completed his work in 1450, but an early sixteenth century hand responsible for four entries in the table of years. The hand records the date of the coronation, the date of the King's death, the length of his reign and the burial place for Henry VI, Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III. As Richmond comments, the date of Edward V's death, 22 June, is set down in the cartulary 'as if it were openly known', yet no other source, either contemporary or near contemporary is so specific. Richmond notes that such a date for the boys' murder would tally well with Mancini's account of Richard's usurpation.⁶⁷ Certainly the time-frame was narrow. Hastings was executed on 13 June, while Mancini left England some time in July. The boys could possibly have died on 22 June by the order of 'duke Richard'. Greater weight, says Richmond, can be accorded the author of the brief correspondence in the Cely letters, to be dated between 13 and 26 June, which is 'justifiably cryptic' when he expresses concern for the lives of the two Princes. If, in fact, the boys were dead then perhaps as Richmond concedes their death facilitated the creation of the duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Nottingham - titles belonging to 'the duke of York - on 28 June.⁶⁸

67. See above, p. 17.

68. Richmond, *'Notes and Documents: The Death of Edward V'*, p. 279; Sayer, *op.cit.*, p. 316. The date does fit into a crescendo of activity which began with the council session on Monday 9 June, and reached its climax with Gloucester receiving the crown on 26 June. Richard's action saw troops ordered from the North, the death of Lord Hastings, and the imprisonment of Rotherham, Morton, Lord Stanley, Edward IV's secretary Oliver King and Jane Shore. Richard, duke of York joined his brother in the Tower. The order was issued for the execution of Earl Rivers, his half-brother, Lord Grey and Sir Thomas Vaughan, while Edward V's coronation was postponed. On 22 June, when, according to the entry, Edward died, sermons were preached in London alleging the bastardy of Edward IV's children, and on the following Tuesday Buckingham utilized his oratorical skills, urging Richard's claim to the Mayor and Aldermen of London.

M. Hicks, among others, has convincingly discredited the reliability of the Anlaby cartulary as a source. Written after 1509, much of the unknown annalist's information is wrong. Significantly, none of the more plausible sources (in terms of reliability and closeness to events) cite 22 June as the date of execution. In addition, Hicks raises doubts as to the King's rationale for the alleged date of death, and has overturned the four pieces of evidence used by Richmond to substantiate the cartulary: Mancini, the relevant Cely letter, the chronicle recently discovered by R.F. Green, and Richard's creation of John Lord Howard as duke of Norfolk on 28 June, 1483.⁶⁹

Any discussion on the death of the Princes, however, will always remain purely speculative. The source which could provide a real insight into the machinations of those traumatic weeks, the Crowland Chronicle, is stubbornly terse. Yet the one point which the continental sources have in common - Richard's involvement in the boys' murder - is also made in a number of English sources. Nowhere is this more evident than in the relevant London chronicles. The three versions of the London chronicles of particular interest are known as 'Vitellius A XVI', Fabyan's *Chronicle* and *The Great Chronicle of London*. Less prone to exaggeration than Rous, their history must be explored in some detail in order to assess their value as a primary source. In addition a chronicle known as 'College of Arms Ms 2M6', first discovered in 1981, is worthy of special attention. Probably compiled around 1513, the chronicle

69. In nailing down some of the 'evidence' Hicks in a later article explores the notion of a plot around July to free the royal children from sanctuary, cited by the Crowland Chronicle, Elizabethan antiquary, John Stow (who dates the plot after Richard's coronation) and by the report of Frenchman Thomas Basin. Referring to 'the fact of an enterprise' written by the King himself on 29 July to his Chancellor, Bishop John Russell (which as P. Tudor-Craig asserts could well refer to the recent murder of the boys), Hicks posits that there was almost certainly a July plot to free the boys. This indicates at least the belief that they had outlived their uncle's coronation, and further discredits the Anlaby cartulary: M. Hicks, 'Did Edward V Outlive His Reign or Did He Outreign His Life?', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 108 (1990), pp.342-345. For R.F. Green's chronicle, known as 'College of Arms Ms 2M6', see below, n. 70. M. Hicks, 'Unweaving the Web: The Plot of July 1483 against Richard III and its Wider Significance', *The Ricardian*, Vol. IX, No. 114 (1991), pp. 106-109. For Stow's plot, J. Stow, *The Annales; Or General Chronicle of England* (London, 1615), p. 460; see also T. Basin, *Histoire de Louis XI*, ed. C. Samaran, Vol. 3, Les Classiques de l'histoire de France (Paris, 1972), p. 234. Hicks notes that M. K. Jones drew attention to Basin's report, written by the beginning of 1484. For further discussion of John Stow and the plot, see below, Chapters 2 and 13. In addition see Gunn, *op.cit.*

alleges that the Princes were murdered by the 'advice' of the duke of Buckingham, an allegation also made by two continental sources.⁷⁰

The chronicles of London were composed between the late thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. The oldest record is to be found in the 'Liber de Antiquis Legibus', compiled in Latin probably by London alderman Arnold Thedmar in 1274. Other London chronicles emerged, among them 'Annales Londoniensis' covering the years 1195 - 1329, compiled perhaps by Andrew Horn (d. 1328) fishmonger and chamberlain of London, who had compiled the *Liber Custumarum*. These are the earliest extant chronicles of London.⁷¹ The first half of the fourteenth century witnessed a decline in such writing. This situation began to change at a time when London and its mercantile community, stimulated by increasing prosperity, channelled part of its new energy into building and embellishing public buildings, schools, endowing chantries and in general, showing signs of civic interest. Simultaneously energy was directed into the writing of the English Chronicles of London.⁷² Kingsford notes that towards 1414 these chronicles began to take shape.⁷³ The 'Main City Chronicle' (1440-85), compiled from a number of earlier chronicles is of special interest as the source of 'The Great Chronicle', the second chronicle of 'Vitellius A XVI' and Robert Fabian's chronicle. In the first two, the narrative to 1485 forms part of a later chronicle ending in 1496. The 'Fabian Ms' or 'Chronicles of England and France' ended originally in 1485. Of these three, 'The Great Chronicle' is the most fully representative of the 'Main City Chronicle'.⁷⁴ 'The Great Chronicle' and Fabian's Chronicle were both compiled by Robert Fabian of London (d. 1513), sheriff, alderman and a member of the Draper's Company.

70. R.F. Green, 'Historical notes of a London citizen, 1483-1488', *E.H.R.*, Vol. 96 (1981), pp. 585-590; see below, p. 24.

71. *Six Town Chronicles of England*, ed. R. Flenley (Oxford, 1911), pp. 7-9. Kingsford, *op.cit.*, pp. 71-8.

72. Flenley, *ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

73. Flenley suggests that the earliest extant of the English chronicles finishes with a list of city officers for 1432-3 - that being the 'St John's College Chronicle', which ends three years later in 'Cotton Julius B II'; then 'Vitellius F.IX' ending in 1439 and 'Harley 565' ending in 1443. 'Cleopatra C.IV' also closed in this year. 'MS Cotton Vitellius A XVI' was the last of the fifteenth-century manuscript chronicles. Little writing occurred during the mid-decades of the century. While early portions of some of the following - 'MS Rawlinson B 355', 'Bale's Chronicle', 'Harley Roll C 8', 'A Short English Chronicle', 'Gregory's Chronicle', and 'MS Gough London', may have begun in the latter part of Henry VI's reign, the reign of Edward IV witnessed the revival of chronicle writing. Flenley, *ibid.*, p. 16. and Kingsford, *op.cit.*, pp. 80-1.

74. Kingsford, *ibid.*, pp. 99-101.

Fabian made use of the second portion of the Vitellius Chronicle, 1474-85, which, probably compiled soon after the reign of Richard III, was in itself a redaction of earlier sources.⁷⁵ This is evident as 'The Great Chronicle', although far more detailed, shares with the 'Vitellius A XVI' similarities in chronology, in factual error, in detail and in language. Significantly both chronicles deal with the removal of the duke of York to the Tower soon after 4 May, and Gloucester's triumphant journey through London. The younger Prince was however transferred on 16 June.⁷⁶ Both wrongly cite Thomas Grey, marquis of Dorset as Edward V's companion on his journey to London in April when in fact Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers was his guardian at this time.⁷⁷ Detail of events is at times recorded in similar language in the chronicles. The narrative of 'Vitellius A XVI' discloses that on 4 May Gloucester and the King were met by the mayor and citizens at 'Harnsy' park: the King riding in blue velvet, and the duke of Gloucester in black cloth'. The amplified description in 'The Great Chronicle' notes that the mayor and his followers 'met with the King in harnesey park his grace riding in blue velvet, and the duke of Gloucester in course black cloth'. Both chronicles mention that on the Sunday following [the execution of Hastings] it was 'declared' at Paul's Cross that the children of King Edward 'were not rightful inheritours unto the crown'.⁷⁸ Buckingham's meeting at the Guildhall in which he proclaimed Gloucester's right to the crown, the description of the investiture, and the King's return to his palace, also show clear parallels.⁷⁹

However it is equally clear that 'The Great Chronicle' drew on a number of other sources for the period, not least in relation to 'Buckingham's rebellion'. Rather tersely 'Vitellius' notes the gravitation of the men of Kent and other regions to the duke of Buckingham - their motivation deriving from Richard's execution of Hastings and the deaths attributed to Richard of his nephews. In gross error 'The Great Chronicle' states that 'Buckingham's rebellion' occurred because it was strongly rumoured that the King had murdered the Princes, poisoned Anne Neville and intended to marry Elizabeth of York, Edward IV's eldest daughter.⁸⁰ Yet

75. *Ibid.*, p. 99; Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxxviii.

76. *Chronicles of London*, p. 190; *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 230.

77. *Chronicles of London*, p. 189. *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 230.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 190; *ibid.*, p. 231 (respectively); Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 113.

79. *Chronicles of London*, pp. 190-1; *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 232.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 191; *ibid.*, p. 234. This also represents a serious chronological error, placing the rebellion in 1485. 'The Great Chronicle's' use of other sources is evidenced by its inclusion of Stanley's presence in the Tower in 1483. 'The Great Chronicle' like Rous, mentions Stanley's injury and arrest, followed 'immediately' by his release because Richard feared retaliation from his son Lord Strange in Lancashire: *ibid.*, p. 231; Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 113. It should also be noted that 'The

reminiscent of the second continuator, 'The Great Chronicle' stresses the independent action of the gentry rebels and like the chronicle, names names. 'Many knights and men of worship' rose ('with all the power that they could make') including knights Thomas St Leger and George Brown, and esquires William Clifford, Thomas Ramney 'with many others'.⁸¹ Ducal cowardice and/or inability to muster his followers forced the rebels to disband their retinues and fend 'for themselves in the best wise that they might'.⁸²

While the 'College of Arms Ms 2M6' like 'Vitellius' and 'The Great Chronicle' highlights the duke of Buckingham's leadership in the rising, the differences in language and detail indicate that the annals may not have been the work of a redactor but commentary from a first hand source of information.⁸³ Of most interest is the chronicler's comment concerning Edward IV's sons who 'were put to death in the Tower of London by the "wise" [advice] of the duke of Buckingham'. Interestingly this charge is echoed in another contemporary English source among the Ashmolean manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, which asserts that Richard sounded out Buckingham before murdering the Princes.⁸⁴ Both Molinet and Commynes also mention Buckingham in this context, but the former curtly dismisses the possibility, while the latter contradicts himself. In regard to 'College of Arms Ms 2M6', as R. F. Green says this is one of several 'startling' comments from a source, which, if accepted as legitimate provides the earliest extant information on the period. In relation to Buckingham's 'involvement' however,

the other sources mention that the Protector himself persuaded the Queen 'with his manyfold promysys', to relinquish her son. Similarly 'The Great Chronicle' is the only source which mentions a 'last meal' having been taken by Hastings with Gloucester on the morning of his execution. The Crowland chronicler suggests that Richard was already at the Tower when Hastings arrived. 'Vitellius A XVI' simply notes that 'on the 13th day of June the duke of Gloucester, suddenly without judgement, caused Lord Hastings...to be beheaded within the Tower': *The Great Chronicle of London*, pp. 230-1; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 159; *Chronicles of London*, p. 190; see also Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 113-16.

81. While St Leger is mentioned in both the Crowland Chronicle and 'The Great Chronicle' the latter is the first chronicle to mention Brown, Clifford and Ramney.

82. *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 234.

83. Green, *op.cit.*; Green notes that the probable source for 'College of Arms Ms 2M6' was the commonplace book of a London merchant, quite possibly a first-hand source, 'and thus a witness living close to the scene of the crime.' The traditional date of Hastings's death is given; the assertion that 'many more' died with Rivers, Grey, Haute and Vaughan in the north; some valuable information concerning 'resistance made in the parliament time [1487]... which caused iiij of the king's servants hanged at the Tower Hill'.

84. For the Ashmolean Ms, see A. J. Pollard, *op.cit.*, p.122.

'there is nothing very surprising', though for Richard's apologists it is a valuable piece of evidence by which to attempt to exculpate the King.⁸⁵

As Hanham observes it is doubtful whether many of the chronicles or their audience 'made the modern distinction between surviving tradition, legend, and private embroidery'.⁸⁶ With reference to 'The Great Chronicle', errors of fact and chronology highlight the point that the chronicle 'has many of the faults common to its genre'.⁸⁷ Fabian, however, made no pretence to originality and stated that his evidence 'was gathered with small understanding'.⁸⁸ While some first hand experience doubtless enabled him to colour the account of Gloucester's journey through London, and to describe the sartorial elegance of the notables, away from the centre of political events, Fabian and others gathered news from hearsay, newsletters, occasionally from official documents. Despite their limitations, the 'Vitellius A XVI' and 'The Great Chronicle' most probably drew on material which was written in the first instance contemporaneously 'with the events which they recorded', ⁸⁹ and it is too dismissive to regard the London Chronicles simply as a 'baffling mixture of borrowed material and innovations'.⁹⁰

The chronicles have an important place in the historical writing of the period as contemporary records of events in the capital to which other contemporary and later writers had access. For despite their omissions or embellishments, presumably they did reflect in some measure the popular opinion of London - most significantly - that Richard III was guilty of the murder of his nephews. This view voiced at the French court in January, 1484, is also found in the work of Dominic Mancini, and the 'second continuation' of the Crowland Chronicle; it is echoed in the continental sources and, a generation later, in the work of gifted Renaissance historian, Polydore Vergil.⁹¹

Vergil doubtless tapped the London Chronicles as well as every available source for snippets of information. However the literary style and critical approach embodied in his sophisticated *Anglica Historia* contrasts with most works previously written on English history and heralds a new direction in the writing of historical literature. A Latinist of

85. For further discussion on Buckingham's role in the boys' murder and notes on Commynes and Molinet see below, Part 4, Chapter 13.

86. Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 116.

87. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xl.

88. Kingsford, *op.cit.*, p. 105.

89. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

90. Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 115.

91. Mancini, *op. cit*; E. M. Nokes and G. Wheeler, *op.cit*; Commynes, *op. cit.*, pp. 353-4.

distinction, Vergil utilized humanist principles in his writing and sought to provide a 'living' history whose ambit included law, philosophy and religion. He exercised judgement in his craft and was 'in short an historian and not an annalist'.⁹² Whereas the chroniclers had recorded events on a yearly basis, Vergil provided continuity in his work by focussing on the succession of Kings. Whereas the chroniclers either omitted or embroidered important incidents - Vergil weighed up the information and used his critical ability 'to resolve conflicting interpretations'.⁹³ His portrait of Richard III fits into a schematic framework in which all fifteenth-century Kings 'were especially subject to the workings of divine retribution'.⁹⁴ Like his antecessors Richard is vulnerable simply because 'immutable human nature and mutable fortune play a never-ending game'.⁹⁵ For Vergil, Henry IV initiated the ills of the century by breaking his solemn oath of allegiance to Richard II. His descendants paid horribly for his crime: Henry VI was born to misery. However, those who enacted retribution were themselves agents of destruction. Edward IV also breached a solemn oath and the sins of the father were visited upon the children who were murdered by Richard III. This King, however, the most sinful of all, lost his crown to Henry VII at Bosworth. The latter's victory, his marriage to Elizabeth of York, and the accession of their son, Henry VIII, in Vergil's own time, finally ended the 'chain of calamity'.⁹⁶

Because Vergil's work is a major source for the study of Richard III's reign, certain questions pertinent to this discussion must be raised: How reliable was he given his reputation as an engineer of the Tudor tradition? How close, some twenty years on was he to the events of 1483 - indeed just where did he obtain all his information? Writers have explored in detail the reputation that Vergil has received as a generator of the Tudor tradition;⁹⁷ an important assignment as Vergil has provided the fullest primary account of the reign of Richard III. Encouraged by Henry VII to write a history of England on his arrival in 1502, his *Anglica Historia* was not finished until August 1533 and did not reach the press until 1534, by which time he was not concerned with the possible favours of a Tudor King.⁹⁸ He had been patronised during Henry VII's last years, having been made archdeacon of Wells in 1508, and while this was perhaps more the result of his Italian patron Cardinal Andriano Castelli and his influence

92. *Six Town Chronicles of England*, p. 43; In general see D. Hay, *Polydore Vergil: Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters* (Oxford, 1952), p. 92 see also Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 125.

93. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxix..

94. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxiv.

95. Hay, *op.cit.*, p. 136.

96. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxxi.

97. See for example Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 126; Ross, *Richard III*, pp. xxii-xxiv.

98. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxiii.

with Henry,⁹⁹ Vergil was not without influential and distinguished friends at court, and was, apparently, well received by Richard Fox, Bishop of Winchester and other learned men such as Sir Thomas More, Pace, Linacre, Tunstal and Latimer.¹⁰⁰ He appears to have received no patronage after 1513, perhaps due to a falling out with Cardinal Wolsey who had employed Vergil and Cardinal Chrysogoni (on the death of Julius II) to assist him in procuring his cardinal's hat - apparently not to his satisfaction. So followed for Vergil a period of imprisonment after which he spent most of his remaining years until c.1551 in England. From there he retired to Urbino and died in 1555.¹⁰¹ This brief history is important in coming to terms with his reputation as Tudor propagandist, because it shows that Vergil owed the second Tudor no great favours. Recommended to Henry VII as a man of erudition by those who knew the King as the earl of Richmond in exile, the patronage which he did receive was doubtless commensurate with his ability and contacts.¹⁰²

Manifestly Vergil did not invent the Tudor tradition. As Ross has demonstrated the smear tactics employed by him were also employed in the *Crowland Chronicle*. The latter notes that the 'most pleasant letters to console the Queen', with promises of '...submission and fealty' written by Richard soon after Edward's death, did little to placate Queen Elizabeth or the people of London, 'for the Protector did not, with a sufficient degree of considerateness, take measures for the preservation' of her 'dignity' and 'safety'. After entreating the nobility at York to swear an oath of fealty to the late King's son, (he himself was the first to take the oath) some six or seven weeks later, Richard with the duke of Buckingham did 'thereafter...whatever [he] wanted'.¹⁰³ Dominic Mancini reports a rumour in London that Richard's detention of the King was designed to facilitate his access to the crown, and reports

99. *Six Town Chronicles of England*, p. 41. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxiii. Vergil was presented to the rectory of the church of Langton in Leicestershire in 1503. He represented his relative Cardinal Chrysogoni who was removed from the bishopric of Hereford to the bishopric of Bath and Wells in 1504. 'In 1507 he was collated to the prebend of Scamlesby in the church of Lincoln': *Vergil*, introd., pp. iv-v; see also C.H. Clough, 'Federigo Veterani, Polydore Vergil's "Anglica Historia" and Baldassare Castiglione's "Epistola...ad Henricum Angliae regem"', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXII (1967), pp. 778-9, for information on Vergil's advancement in England.

100. From around 1500 Vergil sustained a friendship with Erasmus. His reputation was built on the publication 'Proverbiorum Libellus' and 'de Inventoribus Rerum' which earned him great acclaim in the literary world, was presented in numerous editions and was translated into several languages: *Vergil*, pp. ii-iii.

101. *Vergil*, pp. vii-xx.

102. *Vergil*, p. iv.

103. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, pp. 155-9.

on Richard's removal of obstacles [Hastings] to obtain this end.¹⁰⁴ Although grossly exaggerated, Rous's account also contains some elements of the Tudor tradition, where together with Richard's repulsive deformities, he was also like Antichrist and 'excessively cruel in his days'.¹⁰⁵ Similarly 'The Great Chronicle' is tinged with ostensible Tudor prejudices.¹⁰⁶ Indeed the evidence of all the available primary sources preceding Vergil and including foreign accounts by Mancini, de Valera, Commynes and Molinet corroborate (in varying degrees) information used by him that Richard was 'disliked and mistrusted in his own time'.¹⁰⁷

In the interests of harmony at the Tudor court Vergil needed to be discreet at times and not overplay certain incidents. For example he understresses the support that Richard did in fact have in early May by stating: 'Thus Richard, without assent of the commonality, by might and will of certain noblemen of his faction, enjoyed the realm, contrary to the law of God and man'.¹⁰⁸ Omitting the fact that Gloucester was appointed Protector by the council, Vergil briefly comments 'then did duke Richard assume the government wholly'.¹⁰⁹ Hanham suggests that the misgivings felt by Hastings, Morton and Rotherham ('the three strongest supports of the new King') over Richard's actions several weeks later were deliberately played down 'just because (although the legal position was rather tricky) Richard as Protector had undoubtedly been entitled to allegiance'.¹¹⁰ Further, that the motive for Vergil's 'diplomacy' lies in the fact that Hastings, Morton and Rotherham were not promoting the interests of Henry Tudor in 1483, and in the light of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck it was prudent not to mention a conspiracy with the Woodvilles - albeit against the Protector. Perhaps it can be assumed that sedition could be countenanced 'only when the rebel was the successful earl of Richmond'.¹¹¹

Similarly Vergil does not cite Buckingham's speech at the Guildhall around 24 June (mentioned by both Mancini and the second continuator) in which Edward's alleged pre-contract with Lady Eleanor Butler was made public and the young Princes declared ineligible to succeed. Vergil refers to Dr Ralph Shaw's sermon at St Paul's Cross, saying that 'there is a common report that in Sha's sermon Edward's children were called bastards...which is devoid

104. Mancini, ch. 5.

105. Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 123.

106. Kingsford, *op.cit.*, p. 101.

107. Ross, *Richard III*, pp. xlvi-xlvii.

108. Vergil, p. 187.

109. Vergil, p. 176.

110. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 159; Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 128.

111. Hanham, *ibid.*

of any truth'.¹¹² Clearly Vergil had to juggle his integrity as a scholar with the realities of political diplomacy. Doubtless Henry VII would not have welcomed reference to the alleged pre-contract as it called into question the title of Queen Elizabeth.¹¹³

While Vergil was not innovative in the hostility he directed at Richard, his role in developing the Tudor tradition can be seen more clearly in his treatment of Buckingham and the rebellion, which is in marked contrast to the account in the *Crowland Chronicle*. Whereas the continuator stresses the independence of the gentry in the southern counties and almost tacks on Buckingham's volte-face as an afterthought, Vergil's emphasis is on the key conspirators and throughout he makes a sound effort to put a favourable light on Buckingham's involvement. For instance, when Buckingham retired to Wales soon after Richard began his journey northward, he was apparently piqued over the King's refusal to grant him the other half of the Bohun inheritance. Partly over this and 'partly repenting that...[he] had not resisted King Richard's evil enterprise, but had much furthered the same, he resolved to separate himself from him...and to bring to pass the thing which he had long revolved in his mind'.¹¹⁴ Yet Polydore goes on to state that the 'common report was otherwise; for the multitude said that the duke did the less dissuade King Richard from usurping the Kingdom, by means of so many mischievous deeds, upon that intent that he afterward, being hated of both God and man, might be expelled from the same'. While it seems that Vergil presents all the evidence which he has obtained, he is also at pains to stress Buckingham's repentance and is, perhaps, deliberately dismissive of the 'common report' to this end. Whether or not this section was written before or after the execution of the third duke of Buckingham for treason in 1521, Vergil was also, no doubt, cautiously implying that the dark qualities in the father, redeemable in certain circumstances, were manifested in the son as 'intransigent opposition' to be dealt with accordingly.¹¹⁵

The *Crowland* chronicler however, is not as kind to the duke, who represents a sinister influence in his account. Although Richard was the ringleader in the arrest of Rivers, Grey and Vaughan at Stony Stratford, the situation had deteriorated after the arrival of Buckingham in

112. Vergil, p. 184.

113. Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 128-9.

114. Vergil, p. 194.

115. C. Rawcliffe, 'Henry VII and Edward, Duke of Buckingham: the Repression of an "Over-mighty Subject"', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. 53 (1980), pp. 114-18; D. Hay, 'The Manuscript of Polydore Vergil's "Anglica Historia"', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LIV (1939), pp. 247-8, for opinions suppressed for political reasons; see also A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London, 1982), p. 444.

the evening. After Hastings's execution and the duke of York's imprisonment, Gloucester and Buckingham 'showed their intentions, not in private but openly'. Perhaps Buckingham was the 'sole mover at London' of the 'disgraceful proceedings' to which the chronicler refers. It was (as noted) Buckingham who had suggested the Tower of London as a suitable abode for the King and to which the others finally agreed after some opposition. While Vergil presents the duke as at times an almost unwilling accomplice, and 'whether it were for fear or for obedience' Buckingham 'held ever with him', the continuator portrays Richard as being greatly influenced by Buckingham.¹¹⁶

The Tudor view of the relationship in the summer and autumn of 1483 contains three main elements: Richard's manipulative powers and treachery which seduced one of the leading nobles of the realm; Buckingham's about-face and repentance at having been a party to such treachery; finally his determination to expiate his sins by helping Henry Tudor attain the crown, and then be united in marriage with Elizabeth of York. This view places the blame both for the rebellion and the misconduct of a leading noble squarely in Richard's court. The moral content of this scenario is that a great lord falls victim only to a most devious King, realises his treachery and sets about to promote the leader who can restore sanity to the realm. Despite Vergil's slant on this particular aspect of 1483, he did not, he comments, aim to tell a partisan history and 'always claimed to tell the truth'.¹¹⁷ Doubtless Vergil was constrained at times by the Tudor view and the type of information presented to him. Inevitably the discussion must now focus more closely on the type of information to which he had access.

In addition to his likely use of the London chronicles Vergil probably had access to the 'second continuation' of the Crowland Chronicle. There are, in fact, some similarities between the two which they do not share with 'The Great Chronicle'. Vergil fairly accurately cites the continuator's details concerning the duke of Clarence's downfall in 1478.¹¹⁸ There is also a parallel between the Crowland Chronicle and Vergil in regard to the division of the council before Hastings's arrest (although it is Vergil who notes that Russell was not privy to these proceedings), and over the description of how Morton and Buckingham sent for Henry Tudor. Neither of these accounts appear in 'The Great Chronicle', yet both these points would have been known to people with access to court and council sources - not to Londoners. Perhaps as

116. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 159; *Vergil*, p. 174. Significantly this view also deflects attention from Buckingham as a possible guilty party in the Princes' murder; to be discussed in Part 4.

117. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxiii.

118. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, pp. 145-7; *Vergil*, p. 167; *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 226. See in general Hanham, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-42.

Hanham mentions, a copy of the manuscript circulated outside the abbey to which Vergil had access, but it is more likely that Vergil himself tapped court sources for this information. Indeed Vergil added to the information obtained from the London Chronicles by seeking out those informed men who were still alive. The historian notes that with a paucity of sources after 1450, he had recourse to oral history:

I betook myself to every man of age who was pointed out to me as having been formerly occupied in important and public affairs, and from all such I obtained information about events up to the year 1500. 119

As observed Vergil's entree to the Tudor court was facilitated by those who were acquainted with the scholar having studied in Italy or served abroad as diplomats, or who were at least familiar with his work. Recommended by people such as Cardinal Morton, Bishop Fox of Winchester, Reginald Bray and Christopher Urswick, Henry VII's confessor, all but Morton were alive in 1502. Vergil himself claims to have consulted 'many who were not of least authority amongst the King's council [court] at that time' concerning the circumstances of Edward's death. Hanham queries those of the council still alive when Vergil began his history.¹²⁰ However as J.R. Lander has demonstrated, one hundred and twenty four people were termed 'councillor' between 1461 - 1483. Significantly for the second period, 1471 - 1483, eighty two names exist. Clearly business was conducted on a day-to-day basis with a core of key councillors, this group itself subject to changes in personnel depending on the type of business at hand and the standing of the men involved.¹²¹ It is quite possible then that there were a number of men of Edward's court who were informed - at least through their connections - with the events of 1483. More specifically it is possible that men such as Lord Stanley, a participant in some of the events which Vergil discusses, provided the historian with information; for example the incident in the Tower in which Stanley was arrested with Hastings, Morton and Rotherham.¹²²

Similarly, either Stanley or Reginald Bray might have been Vergil's source on aspects of the rising for which there is no apparent earlier written source. For instance Vergil notes that Margaret Beaufort appointed her servant Reginald Bray to recruit 'noble or worshipful

119. Kingsford, *op.cit.*, p. 257 ; Hanham, *op.cit.*, p.131.

120. Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 131-2.

121. Lander, *op.cit.*, pp. 151-2, 158.

122. Vergil, p. 182; Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 132-3. Vergil however also agrees here with 'The Great Chronicle' that Stanley was released forthwith (initially at least in the chronicle) due to Richard's fear of Lord Strange's contingent in Lancashire.

men...able to make help in the cause'. Shortly after, Sir Giles Daubenay, Richard Guildford, Thomas Ramney, John Cheyney and 'many more' were sworn to service 'having taken an oath'. Other conspirators in Lady Margaret's service such as Christopher Urswyck, and Hugh Conway played a large role, the latter having been sent to Brittany by the countess on learning of Buckingham's commitment to the rising, to confer with her son, Henry Tudor. While most of the names and some of the information were available from the official records, Reginald Bray was neither attainted or listed as a rebel, nor does he feature in the chronicle accounts. Likewise, Vergil provides detail from an unknown source on the Marquis of Dorset, who, with Thomas Lovell's assistance had fled sanctuary and prior to the rising, according to Vergil, was busy recruiting in Yorkshire.¹²³ Again, much of Vergil's detail of the plot, not available in the contemporary accounts, demonstrates his use of oral sources and the possibility of Stanley's help, and like-minded associates in this context.¹²⁴

Vergil's information was doubtless gleaned from a great many mouths at court and further afield and scholars of the period must needs accept his account (and Tudor prejudices) and assimilate his material with the information supplied by the second continuator of the Crowland Chronicle and the most informed of the London chronicles for the period, 'The Great Chronicle'. As with the Crowland chronicler his omissions or evasions doubtless stem from a well-judged circumspection given the constraints of the period. Unlike the second continuator, however, Vergil was at the mercy of his sources both written and oral. Unlike the Crowland chronicler, he was not privy to the events which he described in his history, and unlike both the continuator and the compilers of the London Chronicles, he was not writing contemporaneously with the events which he set down.

Polydore Vergil did not invent the Tudor legend, but his role in its development is large. Indeed both he and Sir Thomas More have been labelled with 'the distinction of having enriched history with the legend of a monster King'; described, as noted, as 'the twin architects of the Tudor tradition' and creators of 'the saga of King Richard'.¹²⁵ Accordingly debate has raged through the centuries on the historical merit of Vergil's *Anglica Historia* and More's *History of King Richard the Third*. Most agree that while Vergil brought to his work the authority of a real historian, More's contribution - albeit a literary masterpiece - has brought little of historical value to the world of scholarship. Vilified for his role in Tudor

123. Vergil, p. 199; 'Vitellius A XVI' comments that Dorset escaped around the time of Richard's coronation, and 'for whom King Richard made narrow and busy search': 'Vitellius A XVI', p. 191.

124. Vergil, pp. 196-7. Bray died in 1503, Dorset in 1501. It is possible that Vergil had direct contact with the former soon after his arrival at the English court in 1502.

125. J. Potter, *Good King Richard?* (London, 1983), p. 100.

historiography, More has been described by Sir George Buck as 'the greatest of...the accusers of King Richard', and a man whose work he 'found guilty and false'. In 1768 Sir Horace Walpole described More as 'an historian who is capable of employing truth only as cement in a fabric of fiction'; while more contemporary criticism condemns his history as 'really a mere historical romance', indeed, 'literary art and not historical science'. Moreover a work which contains 'gross inaccuracies', with 'apparently wilful distortions of fact and urgent bias', which 'are not nearly so surprising as the positive virulence which informs it'.¹²⁶ Even those who see its historical merit acknowledge its many difficulties: 'its authorship and authority, its sources and the motive of its conception, and the reasons behind its unfinished state'.¹²⁷ Should it in fact be regarded as a primary source for the early months of Richard III's reign? Although it was written almost contemporaneously with Vergil's history, Ross claims that it is not as serious or sober an account. Despite, says Ross, his dependence on Vergil's work 'to which More may well have had access in manuscript', it has justifiably been questioned whether he was writing history 'in the modern as opposed to the classical sense of the word (i.e. drama)', at all.¹²⁸

There is no evidence to suggest that More had access to Vergil's manuscript, despite his acquaintance with the scholar.¹²⁹ Clearly More's sources did not differ substantially from Vergil's, and this has led historians to stress what they felt was its highly derivative nature. More's education in Morton's household *should* have given him valuable insights on 1483; yet he followed Vergil in the slim pickings provided by the London chronicles, newsletters and official documents, and most particularly hearsay.¹³⁰ Indeed A. F. Pollard wrote that 'As

-
126. Sir George Buck, *The History of King Richard III* (1619), ed. A.N. Kincaid (Gloucester, 1982), p. 196; Walpole, cited in Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxvi; J. Ramsay, *Lancaster and York* (Oxford, 1892), Vol. 2, p. 486 n; A.F. Pollard, 'The Making of Sir Thomas More's "Richard III"', *History*, Vol. XVII (1933), pp. 317-23; Kendall, *op.cit.*, p. 442. The text survives in five different versions of differing length. The first published version (1543) is very different from the 'authentic' version printed by the author's nephew, William Rastell in 1557. See Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 153, and R. Marius, *Thomas More* (New York, 1985) p. 119.
127. A.F. Pollard, 'The Making of Sir Thomas More's Richard III', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed. J. G. Edwards (Manchester, 1933), p. 223.
128. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxvi; see also Hanham for her discussion as to whether More perhaps had access to Vergil's work: Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 146-7, 159.
129. Ross himself states that on a key issue such as the sources for the conspiracy, More does not follow Vergil.
130. Gransden, *op.cit.*, p. 451.

history, More's book stands or falls by the value of its oral information'.¹³¹ More, himself, acknowledges his use of oral sources by general phrases such as 'it is for truth reported', 'as fame runneth', 'this have I by credible information learned' and 'as I have learned of them that much knew and little cause had to lie'.¹³² Unfortunately only once does More name an informant: he cites information gathered from his father, who heard it from a certain 'Mystlebrooke', who in turn, had it from 'one Pottyer dwelling in Red Cross street without Cripplegate'. Mystlebrooke was almost certainly William Mistlebrook (d. 1513), a servant of Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII. Pottyer was, it seems, a servant of Richard III who became an attorney in the Chancery of the duchy of Lancaster in 1483. Like Vergil, it is likely that More sought out the participants of 1483 or their associates who were still alive when he wrote his history. It is instructive, for example, that he alone mentions Richard's conciliatory gesture to Sir John Fogge on the eve of his coronation; information which, given the Gloucester-Woodville antipathy and Fogge's connections with the latter, seems both credible and indicative of More's close contacts.¹³³

It is ironic that while decrying More's work, historians such as Buck have used his history extensively for the five months following Edward IV's death and have closely followed Hall, Holinshed, Stow and others who at times have copied More *verbatim*.¹³⁴ Buck's use of More is evident in his treatment of More's final theme - Morton's mastery of Buckingham at Brecon. In a departure from Vergil, More has John Morton rather than Buckingham devise the plot in Wales, in which he 'joined gentlemen together in aid of King Henry [Henry Tudor]' and seduced the duke by feeding his vanity and inciting his jealousy.¹³⁵ According to More (and Buck) the duke most probably rebelled because of his greed and ambition. He was a proud and opportunistic man who 'evil could bear the glory of another', and Morton, aware of his dissatisfaction was able to feed him 'with fair words and pleasant praises' seeming 'to follow him than to lead him' towards revolt.¹³⁶

131. A. F. Pollard, 'The Making of Sir Thomas More's Richard III', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, p. 228.

132. St. Thomas More, *The History of King Richard III*, ed. R. S. Sylvester (London, 1976), pp. 8-9, 89.

133. *Ibid.*, p. 84.

134. For example, Buck, *op.cit.*, Book 1:26 for his account of the grasping Woodvilles; More is also Buck's source for the death of Hastings; see 1:26 and n. 241; for Buck's use of More's account at Brecon, 1:29/29-36 and n.243. For Hall, see below, Chapter 2.

135. More, *op.cit.*, p. 93; for Buckingham's plot in Vergil's account, *Vergil*, pp. 30-1, 34.

136. More, *ibid.*, pp. 93-4 and see above, n. 134.

Like Vergil, More stressed the wicked nature and evil intent of Richard III. According to More the King alone conceived the plan to murder his nephews in case 'men would not reckon that he could have right to the realm'.¹³⁷ While Buckingham is not mentioned in this context, still his role in securing the throne for Richard is large. Undoubtedly More's observation after the coronation, 'now fell there mischiefs thick' implicates Buckingham as well as Richard.¹³⁸ However unlike Vergil and the later chronicles More was not interested in Buckingham's moral redemption. Accordingly the death of the Princes did not prick the duke's conscience and cause him to rebel; nor is the issue of the Bohun lands given serious consideration by More. Though the duke's disagreement with Richard was 'of divers men diversely reported', More indicates that Buckingham, prompted by Morton, felt that he deserved better than to be Richard's right-hand man.¹³⁹ Yet while Vergil and the subsequent chronicles differ from More on this point, More's influence on later works as regards Buckingham is evident in the role accorded him on the eve of revolt. More has Buckingham occupy centre stage, a position he maintains in the chronicle accounts and in Shakespeare's *King Richard III*. Moreover the abrupt termination of his history at Brecon focusses attention on the duke, seemingly poised and ready for action.¹⁴⁰

Sir Thomas More, like Vergil, greatly interested in humanist scholarship, was far more concerned than the latter with the theme of morality as it affected rulers, most evident in his *Richard III*. Yet as with *Anglica Historia*, More's history was not written as a piece of Tudor propaganda; in fact More was critical of Henry VII.¹⁴¹ Written most probably between 1510 and 1518 the work was not published until after his execution in 1535, by which time his busy schedule involving duties as a King's councillor and master of requests, perhaps prevented its completion. It is more likely, however, that the reasons for More's abrupt conclusion on the eve of Buckingham's revolt have much in common with the reasons for Vergil's 'diplomacy' in handling Buckingham's role in the rising. In 1515, Edward Stafford, third duke of Buckingham petitioned the King for financial redress, resulting from actions by Henry VII in demanding money from him. As C. Rawcliffe states, the duke's father, having been executed for mounting a

137. More, *ibid.*, p. 85.

138. Buckingham allegedly offered to place a sizeable retinue at Richard's disposal after Edward IV's death. Later, he joined Richard at Northampton with 300 horses 'and from thence still continued with, partner of all his devises, till that after his coronation they departed, as it seemed, very great friends at Gloucester': More, *ibid.*, pp. 84, 90-1.

139. *Ibid.*, p. 91 for quotation, and see pp. 91-6 for the duke's motives.

140. It should be noted that Hall also sees the duke as proud and opportunistic; still, his integrity surfaces at Brecon, where Buckingham repents for his crimes with Richard.

141. For More's criticism of Henry VII, see his poem on the coronation of Henry VIII, More, *ibid.*, pp. 131, 133.

revolt in favour of Henry Tudor, had, nevertheless, prejudiced 'the Staffords' subsequent relations with the crown'.¹⁴² Although his grievances were real enough, Buckingham, noted for his political intransigence, was viewed by the King as 'an overmighty subject grown too large', and in 1521 was executed for treason. Most probably prudence was responsible for More's abrupt termination of *Richard III*, and as A. Gransden comments, perhaps in view of the execution of Edmund de la Pole in 1513 and the third duke of Buckingham in 1521, More shrank from strengthening Henry VIII's hand 'by providing him with historical proof that the Tudors' seizure of power was justified on the grounds that Richard III was the worst possible tyrant'.¹⁴³

For the events surrounding the rebellion of 1483, scholars have picked the bones of the official documents, particularly the Chancery material, borough records and private correspondence, which have enabled at least a bald reconstruction and analysis of the period. To flesh out the structure they have turned to the narrative sources, both English and foreign, the vernacular chronicles and the early sixteenth-century histories. Of all the sources however, the Crowland Chronicle is manifestly the most important primary source. Its most probable author, Bishop Russell was a man noted for his erudition and expertise, and either he, or a member of his staff, provided a sober, informed and perceptive account of the critical events during that year. Closeness to events and reliability of information were not, many historians claim, the hallmark of the work of John Rous, or indeed the relevant chronicles of London. However both sources were contemporary, and to a degree (particularly in the case of the 'Vitellius A XVI' and 'The Great Chronicle') mirrored the opinion of the capital during 1483. Some of their more emotive observations concerning for instance the fate of the Princes, are recorded by Dominic Mancini - whose work is important as a yardstick by which to measure the reliability of other sources up to July of that year. Clearly the London chronicles provided an important source for later writers, most clearly Polydore Vergil, and they serve to show that neither Vergil nor Sir Thomas More created the Tudor tradition. Richard's devious character and wicked intent portrayed in the *Anglica Historia* and *History of King Richard the Third* were noted in all the contemporary evidence; and their charge against Richard for the murder of his nephews is corroborated by Mancini and Rous, four independent continental sources and the relevant London chronicles. Vergil most probably understated certain 'incidents' as evidenced by the above discussion, particularly concerning the role of the duke of Buckingham in the events of 1483. Yet More was also constrained by the political climate, and like Vergil, was no doubt forced to compromise his integrity as a scholar for the political realities of the period. His *History of*

¹⁴². Rawcliffe, *op.cit.*, p. 114.

¹⁴³. Gransden, *op.cit.*, p. 444.

King Richard the Third is an important source for the period, and its use by other writers is testament to this. Its value to the present discussion stems from the insight it provides into opinions concerning Richard in the early Tudor period; opinions which were firmly rooted in 1483. In finishing abruptly on the eve of rebellion, More has unwittingly focussed attention on the role of the duke of Buckingham in Tudor historiography. Over the centuries, historians have speculated on the rationale behind the duke's revolt, and the debate has largely been divided into two clear camps: the traditionalists and the Ricardians. It is on this debate that the following discussion will focus.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORIOGRAPHY

For over five hundred years, popular as well as scholarly interest has been generated by the more emotive aspects of Richard III's reign and those least 'susceptible of historical proof',¹ namely the King's character and the fate of the Princes. Simultaneously, debate has centered on two legends relating to Richard. The traditional view of the King which began to take shape from as early as 1484, was further developed by Renaissance scholars Polydore Vergil and Sir Thomas More. Added to by the chroniclers, Edward Hall, and to a lesser degree, Raphael Holinshed and John Stow, it was immortalised by the dramatist, William Shakespeare, and further influenced by the oral tradition, which found an outlet in ballad and verse. Until recent times, the 'second legend, that associated with Richard's apologists, has depicted a King grossly vilified in English history.'² Modern thought, for the most part, has rejected both extreme views of the King, and in recognising his attributes as well as his failings, historians have presented a more convincing picture of Richard III.

Writing in the early seventeenth century Sir George Buck was the first redoubtable Ricardian and his history inspired later works, most notably Horace Walpole's *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third*, published in 1768. Twenty years on, William Hutton's *The Battle of Bosworth Field*, struck middle ground with his attempt at an objective assessment of Richard III as a complex man, neither better nor worse than his predecessors, but with redeeming virtues. Through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries revisionism flourished; most prominent were works by S. Turner, C. A. Halsted and C. R. Markham. Following the traditional view of Richard were the histories of John Lingard, Sir James Ramsay and James Gairdner, whose debate with Markham, conducted largely in the *English Historical Review*, entertained the historical world for a number of years.

Acclaimed by Ricardians, P.M. Kendall's biography of Richard III (1955) rekindled popular interest in the period at a time when K.B. McFarlane's 'scholarly reassessment of the fifteenth century' led to a reappraisal of gentry activity during the 'Wars of the Roses' by revisionist historians. Interest was further stimulated in the early 1980s when a surge of academic and popular publications marked the quincentenary celebrations of 1483-5. Foremost

1. R. Horrox, 'Recent Work on Richard III - A Survey', Review Article, *The Ricardian*, Vol. 7, No. 95 (1987), p. 280.

2. D. Seward, *Richard III* (Northampton, 1983), p. 15.

among these is C. Ross's biography of Richard (1981) which has influenced later historians, largely content to work within his political ambit. Ross presents a less favourable view of the King than Kendall; however the widespread acceptance of his biography in historical circles, is, in itself, an indication of current thinking. While surprisingly little has changed over the years - considering the flood of material on the period - there is still scholarly work to be done, as R. Horrox says, 'not only on the reign itself but on its significance within the late medieval context'. To a great extent her own work *Richard III: A Study of Service* fulfills this function, as it develops the themes of service and patronage under Richard. The present work explores in some detail gentry service and patronage under Edward IV and during the first few months of Richard's reign; its focus on the leading southern gentry seeks a rationale for 'Buckingham's rebellion' and hopes to illuminate aspects of the King's rule which have not hitherto fully been explored.³

The following discussion is concerned with historians' treatment of the rebellion through the centuries. Until quite recently, the main focus of historiography has centered on the leading characters, Richard III, Buckingham, John Morton, Bishop of Ely, Margaret Beaufort, Lord Stanley and the Woodvilles. In an attempt to compensate for this focus, it is proposed to draw out as much as possible from what has - or has not - been said about the rebellion. The discussion will explore the rising in relation to its participants, its rationale, and, importantly, its significance in terms of Richard's reign. Simultaneously it aims to demonstrate how interpretation has developed both in relation to new sources and in relation to the concerns of the age and academic fashion. Hopefully some general patterns will emerge, most significantly the way in which traditional concern with 'personalities' gives way to new concerns and modern political analysis.

It is proposed to explore the treatment given the rebellion from the sixteenth-century Tudor chroniclers through to the present day. What, over five hundred years have historians made of the revolt: how have they answered the questions, who rebelled, and why? Sixteenth century accounts which viewed the rising as 'Buckingham's rebellion', will be compared and contrasted with modern scholarship which minimizes the duke's role. The part ascribed to the Woodvilles will be examined - can the rising be seen as a factional movement? More generally, was it the 'outs' versus the 'ins'? Was it a revolt of Edward IV's former household servants, prepared to accept Gloucester as Protector but not as King, and later outraged at the disappearance of Edward's sons, as Ross suggests? Have historians wavered in their perception of the rising? For example Horrox in her 1977 Ph.D. treats the revolt as a factional movement. Twelve years on Horrox has broadened her interpretation and a number of factors are shown to

³. Horrox, 'Recent Work on Richard III - A Survey', pp. 280-3.

be in play.⁴ Importantly, what is known of the background of the rebels, their wealth, power and status? Should the focus be more sharply directed on the gentry's capacity for independent, politically responsible action? In this context, how best can the rising be explained?

Edward Hall's *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and York* (1548) encapsulates the main elements of the Tudor tradition. His account of the events following Edward IV's death until Buckingham's meeting with Morton at Brecon follows More's history *verbatim* in places. However between the boys' death and Buckingham's detente with Morton, Hall interpolates material from *The Great Chronicle of London* and Vergil.⁵ In Hall's chronicle, as in the accounts of Vergil and More, Buckingham figures significantly in events with Gloucester after Edward IV's death. Yet as Hanham observes, Hall also includes material from an unknown source.⁶

4. R. Horrox, 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', Ph. D. Thesis (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 52-65; Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 164-177.

5. Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 202-3; E. Hall in Shakespeare, *King Richard III*, ed. A. Hammond (London, 1981), p. 74.

6. Hanham, *ibid.*, p. 203; for example, Richard's oath to Buckingham. At times Hall rearranges material taken from More. For instance Hall describes the episode concerning Buckingham's servant, Percival, whom the duke sent to Gloucester in York after the King's death, in sequence after Edward's death. Presenting both Gloucester and Buckingham as ripe for intrigue, Richard 'being advertised of his brother's death contrived the destruction of his nephews with the usurpation of the royal dignity and crown'. Having determined on this plan of action 'all his intent he kept secret till he knew his friends, of the which Henry duke of Buckingham was the first that sent to him after his brother's death'. With instructions from Buckingham to promise Gloucester 'a thousand good fellows if need were', Percival made a second trip to Richard, then at Nottingham, with further intelligence from his lord. On Gloucester's orders, Buckingham with with a body of horse, 3000 strong, met the duke near Northampton, 'where they first began their unhappy enterprise, and so the duke of Buckingham continued still with the duke of Gloucester till he was crowned king'. In More's history, this event is used in the context of Buckingham's defection from Richard on the eve of the duke's revolt. 'The occasion whereupon the King and the duke fell out is of divers folk divers wise pretended [reported]'. Running through the story, More concludes that the duke, after meeting Richard at Northampton, was 'partner of all his devises, till that after his coronation they departed, as it seemed, very great friends': E. Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and York* (London, 1550), reprinted in facsimilie (Menston, 1970), fos. IIIr-Vv; More, *op.cit.*, pp. 90-1.

In relation to the rising for example, it is Hall who first mentions a chance meeting between Buckingham and Lady Margaret Beaufort on the road between Worcester and Bridgnorth, the duke making his way to Brecon, Lady Margaret to her Stafford manor in Shropshire. According to Hall, Buckingham, outraged by Richard's murder of the Princes had recalled his own Lancastrian claim through his Beaufort grandfather, and resolved to take the crown for himself. Informed of Margaret's plan to overthrow Richard, replacing him with her son, Henry Tudor (whose claim was stronger) the duke's hopes were dashed. After a brief period of anguish, his better side asserted itself and he resolved to lead the rebellion on behalf of Henry Tudor, whose marriage with Elizabeth of York would unite the houses of York and Lancaster.⁷ While Kendall has dismissed this episode, claiming that Lady Margaret was probably busy plotting in London, it is quite possible that such a meeting took place. Just weeks later, Buckingham's manor of Thornbury was at the centre of a conspiracy involving Buckingham, Morton, Bishop Lionel Woodville (who actually stayed at the manor in September) and more than likely, Margaret Beaufort at Bridgnorth.⁸

While the main emphasis is on the events which precede 'Buckingham's rebellion', Hall (with more impact than Vergil, simply because his Buckingham is more devious) nevertheless uses the duke's revolt as a device which both accents Richard's wickedness and stresses the duke's repentance. This device works well as Hall (like Vergil and More) places great emphasis on the evil nature and wicked intent of the King, who despite Buckingham's allegiance, is the prime mover after his brother's death.⁹ Although Buckingham's role in the

7. Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and York*, f. xl. Vergil has an even more noble Buckingham resolve to replace the King with Henry Tudor, on condition that he agree to marry one of Edward's daughters. On informing Morton at Brecon, word was sent to Margaret Beaufort in London, who had already hit upon the plan and enveigled Elizabeth Woodville into conspiracy.

8. Kendall, *op.cit.*, pp. 262-3.

9. Hall, in Shakespeare, fos. v-v, vi-r, vi-v; More, *op.cit.*, p. 42. More writes: 'When the protector had both the children in his hands, he opened himself more boldly, both to certain other men, and also chiefly to the Duke of Buckingham, although I know that many thought that this duke was privy to all the protector's counsel from the beginning. And some of the protector's friends said that the duke was the first mover of the protector to this matter, sending a privy messenger unto him, straight after King Edward's death. But other again, which knew better the subtle wit of the protector, deny that he ever opened his enterprise to the duke until he had brought to pass the things before rehearsed'. Following More almost *verbatim* to this last point, Hall breaks off, 'for when the protector had both children in his possession...he then began to thirst to see the end of his enterprise', yet to avoid suspicion, 'he caused all the lords which he knew to be faithful to the king': Hall, in Shakespeare, f. xiii-r.

King's usurpation is significant, Hall manages to shift the weight of blame from Buckingham to Richard more convincingly than Vergil, by making the latter solely responsible for the death of the Princes; a deed which Buckingham 'never agreed nor condescended to...' and which, in turn, resulted in his rebellion.¹⁰

While the death of the boys outraged the duke, he already had grounds for complaint. According to Hall Buckingham's break with the King was sudden, indeed 'some say this occasion was' only a 'little before the coronation'.¹¹ The duke, citing his request for the full restoration of the Bohun lands, and Richard's refusal (based on his fear of the duke's own royal claim) spoke his mind to Morton at Brecon. Resentful of his shabby treatment, 'As though I had never furthered him but hindered him' indeed, 'as though I had put him down and not set him up', Buckingham nevertheless stressed his horror when he 'was credibly informed of the death of the two young innocents'. Excusing himself from court Buckingham retired immediately to his Welsh seat, Brecon, to plan, so that he 'should be openly revenged'.¹² It is clear that Hall follows More *verbatim* in his account of Buckingham's seduction by Morton at Brecon. Both sources depict the duke as a dissimulator - proud and opportunistic - and in both Richard alone

10. Until the death of the Princes, Buckingham was Richard's right hand man. In early June the duke sought to allay the Queen dowager's fear of relinquishing her younger son into the protector's custody, for 'she well knoweth that she needeth no such thing to fear, either for her son or for herself...' After the duke's removal however, 'common people' as well as 'some lords' such as Stanley, mistrusted the motives of the two dukes, and confided their suspicions to Lord Hastings. To placate the lord chamberlain, Buckingham, with the protector, 'made very good semblance unto the lord Hastings and kept him much in their company'. Yet after the death of the chamberlain, (that 'honourable man...of great authority with his prince'), which caused such a reaction in the city that the protector 'sent in all the haste for many substantial men', Buckingham stood resolutely at Richard's side as he told those assembled of the Woodville-Hastings plot to destroy both himself and the duke. Having contrived with Richard the 'bastardy in king Edward'...'or in his children, or both', Buckingham, eloquent and 'marvellously well spoken', pleaded Richard's case at the Guildhall, to divers lords and knights. The following day at 'Baynardes castle', the duke, with many notables, entreated a disingenuous Richard to accept the crown; see Hall, in Shakespeare, fos. vii-v, xiii-r, x-v, xvii-v, xxv-r, xxiii-v, xxiiii r; More, *op.cit.*, pp. 23, 29, 46; for Hastings's death, pp. 52-3, for bastardy of Edward's sons, pp. 79-82. Like More, Hall wrongly cites Elizabeth Lucy as the woman with whom Edward entered into a pre-marriage contract: Hall, in Shakespeare, fos. xxvii-r, xxvii-v; for quotation, *ibid.*, f. xxiiii; More, *op.cit.*, pp. 74-5.

11. Hall, in Shakespeare, f. xxx-r.

12. Hall, in Shakespeare, f. xxxiiii-v.

is responsible for the murder of the Princes. Yet Hall's interpretation of the duke's reason for revolt resembles that of Vergil. For despite Buckingham's recent appalling behaviour, Hall stresses the duke's moral indignation and sudden about-face from the King, who, though not directly accused of murder, had clearly conceived the plan.¹³ Yet again, while Hall follows Vergil in stressing Richard's guilt, unlike Vergil, Buckingham's revolt was not (implicitly at least) the product of guilt over his complicity in the murders. Rather, Hall's Buckingham is absolved of this crime.

For Hall, the duke's rebellion was the result of outrage against the King over the death of the Princes. And in this context Hall more deliberately than Vergil, makes Richard III the sole focus of denigration. Just two decades on, Richard's reputation had already deteriorated. In portraying Buckingham's moral outrage over Richard's action (no doubt fuelled with Morton's help) Hall throws the character of the King into black relief, while Buckingham gets off lightly - he was, after all attempting to save the realm from the worst possible tyrant.¹⁴ This is implicit in Hall's treatment of the rising which, together with Buckingham's downfall, provides a useful vehicle for such expression. However while his emphasis is on the leading personalities and the dominant theme, the tyranny of Richard, Hall supplies less detail than Vergil on the rising, although like the latter, he stresses the gentry component in the revolt. Closely following Vergil, Hall names the leading gentry in the main centres of rebellion: the Courtenays, Sir Edward and his brother, Peter, Bishop of Exeter, who raised the West Country, and Sir Richard Guildford in Kent, who 'collected a great company of soldiers and openly began war'.¹⁵ Hall details Richard's swift journey South, and the duke's downfall - the product of inclement weather and a desultory following - while accenting the theme of betrayal in Ralph Bannaster's treachery, who 'in great haste and evil speed conveyed him to the city of

13. Hall, in Shakespeare, f. xxxiiii-v; *Vergil*, p. 194. Conversely, More has no time to pursue this theme. Finishing his history on the eve of revolt, More's Buckingham is not contrite. After he left the King at Gloucester, he returned to Brecon where Morton, 'very well learned, and honourable...lacking no wise ways to win favour', and with 'a deep insight in politic, worldly drifts', was able to read his mood. Skilfully, Morton was able to seduce into intrigue this 'high-minded man' who 'evil could bear the glory of another...': More, *op.cit.*, pp. 91-3.

14. Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and York*, f. viii; yet Hall was also keen to emphasise another version of the duke's rationale. In fact he states that men felt that Buckingham's volte-face was more the product of hatred toward Richard, than favour to the earl of Richmond, 'but of such a doubtful matter it is not best to judge': Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and York*, ff. xi v - xii r.

15. Hall, in Shakespeare, f. xxxix-r; *Vergil*, p. 199.

Salisbury'.¹⁶ In stressing Bannaster's role, Hall now presents the duke as a genuinely sympathetic character who has come full-circle in his moral rehabilitation from the disingenuous lord with Morton at Brecon, to the victim of Bannaster in the 'Buckingham tragedy'.¹⁷

Ross stresses that Hall's work reveals the 'characteristic "correct" attitudes of the Tudor Englishman'. Less constrained by the political climate than both Vergil and More, his attitudes were influenced, says Ross, by his 'own chauvinism and staunch Protestantism, and partly reflected the propaganda of the regime'.¹⁸ Like Vergil, Hall was able to work around the notion implicit in Tudor tradition that all Kings must be obeyed, only by making Richard III an exception. Historically, 'Buckingham's rebellion' like Henry Tudor's usurpation in 1485, could only be justified because the King was a monster whom the duke sought and failed to overthrow in 1483, but whose tyranny finally ended two years later. Hall works within the same schematic framework as Vergil in which Henry Tudor's overthrow of the tyrant 'fitted into a scheme of divine providence, which ended a long period of suffering beginning with the deposition of Richard II, and reaching a "culmination of savagery in the tyrannous reign of Richard III"'.¹⁹

Clearly Hall embellished episodes to heighten dramatic effect; for example the alleged dialogue between Buckingham and Morton at Brecon. Similarly he suppressed information concerning, for instance, the rhyme written by William Collingbourne in 1484 ('The Rat, the Cat, and Lovell our dog/Rule all England under the hog'). According to Hall, Richard extended 'his bloody fury against a *poor gentleman* called Collingbourne for making a small rhyme', omitting the fact that Collingbourne had invited Henry Tudor to land at Poole, Dorset in October 1484, where he promised the pretender assistance and men.²⁰ However, despite his exaggerations and omissions, Hall played a significant role in the development of the Tudor

16. Hall, in Shakespeare, f. xl-r.

17. For quotation, A. Hammond, introd. to *King Richard III*, p. 87. Hall has copied Vergil's error here in naming Humphrey Bannaster, instead of Ralph Bannaster. *The History of Wem*, taken from a manuscript of S. Garbet, provides some interesting information on Ralph Bannaster, who served in the household of Humphrey, first duke of Buckingham, and had been 'loved, favoured, and trusted', by the duke 'above all his servants': *The History of Wem*, ed. J. Thornhill (Shrewsbury, 1982), p. 363. The whole episode of Buckingham's betrayal was recalled in ballad form and will shortly be discussed.

18. Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxxi..

19. M. J. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth* (Gloucester, 1985), p. 17.

20. See Ross, *Richard III*, p. xxxiii.

tradition. His aim was to stress Richard's wickedness, and in this he went even further than Vergil. Flattering the King before 1483, Hall stresses that Richard's lust for power after his brother's death brought him undone. Hall's portrait of Richard, his denunciation of Buckingham before the rising, and the duke's moral conversion through revolt and betrayal are devices used to denigrate the King. And in this - following Vergil and More, numerous continental sources and the London chronicles over fifty years earlier - Hall merely reflected the attitudes and sentiments of the period.

Between Hall's *Chronicles* and the publication in 1597 of Shakespeare's *King Richard III*, Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* made an appearance in 1578. The relevant section of English history, largely a redaction of More and Hall, makes little contribution to the development of the Tudor tradition. Significantly however, the chronicler adds a new dimension to the size of 'Buckingham's rebellion' using detail supplied by an antiquarian of Exeter.

For the events which preface the rising, Holinshed follows More from April 1483 until Buckingham retires to Brecon, where More's work finishes. Holinshed then picks up Hall's thread, itself taken in part from Vergil. Following Hall, Buckingham who played no role in the murder of the Princes, 'could no longer abide in his [Richard's] court', when he was 'credibly informed' of their death. The duke's about-face, betrayal and death are taken directly from Hall.²¹

Although Holinshed mirrors Hall in this detail, in regard to the rebellion he uses Vergil fairly accurately in his account of those 'who shifted for ..[themselves] and fled' after the collapse of the rising: 'Some went to sanctuary, and to solitary places; some fled by sea [and] ...arrived safely in the duchy of Brittany'.²² In addition he provides some interesting detail taken from Exeter antiquarian John Hooker concerning a list of five hundred rebels indicted for 'high treason' before Lord Scrope of Bolton at Torrington (Devon) in November 1483, including Thomas, marquis of Dorset, Peter, Bishop of Exeter, Sir Thomas St Leger and Sir Thomas Fulford, 'knights as principals'; knights Robert Willoughby and Thomas Arundel, John Arundel, dean of Exeter, David Hopton, archdeacon of Exeter, Oliver, abbot of Buckland, Bartholomew St Leger, William Chilson, Thomas Greenfield, Richard Edgecombe, Robert Burnaby, Walter Courtenay, Thomas Brown, Edward Courtenay, Hugh Luttrell, John Crocker,

21. Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, Vol. III (1808), pp. 409-10.

22. Holinshed has excluded from Vergil's list of refugees the marquis of Dorset's son, Thomas; however from Vergil he has included John 'Burster' (Bourgchier).

John Halwell, and 'five hundred others were indicted as "accessaries"'. A number of these names appear in the Act of Attainder: Dorset, Willoughby, Thomas St Leger, Arundel, Edward and Walter Courtenay, Thomas Brown and Halwell; yet others, including one of the 'principals', Sir Thomas Fulford, do not. Although general pardons were issued to Thomas Greenfield and Richard Edgecombe, implicating them in revolt at least, Hooker's information to which Holinshed had access, further augments our knowledge of those proscribed. In addition (though Hooker's figure of five hundred must be treated with caution) the indictment indicates that substantial numbers were involved, and that many more 'stood' behind each man formally indicted.²³

Like Holinshed the Elizabethan antiquarian John Stow also provides material not found in the earlier Tudor sources, and focusses on the tensions both before and after the rebellion.²⁴ In his *Annales or General Chronicle of England* (1592) Stow is the first to make mention of a specific plot soon after Richard 'had begun his reign in July', and to name the ringleaders. According to Stow, Robert Rushe, serjeant of London, William Davy, pardoner of Hounslow, John Smith, groom of Edward IV's stirrup and Stephen Ireland, wardrober of the Tower, 'with many others' had written to Henry Tudor in Brittany, and 'other lords'. Their purpose was to 'set fire to divers parts of London, which fire while men had been staunching, they would have stolen out of the Tower the Prince Edward and his brother the Duke of York'. Significantly, a contemporary if brief account of the plot appears in the work of Frenchman Thomas Basin, who states that fifty Londoners attempted to rescue the Princes, but did not have the support of the City. Their failure resulted in four executions.²⁵

Stow like the earlier chroniclers has drawn at times word-for-word from More. For example following his account of Richard's coronation, the ensuing plot and the rebels' execution on Tower Hill, he wrote 'now fell there mischief thick...[for] the thing evil gotten is

23. Holinshed, *op.cit.*, p. 421; see above, Chapter 1, for information on the Torrington indictment, and below, Part 4, Chapter 13. Of interest also is Hooker's story used by both Holinshed and Shakespeare concerning Richard's premonition of doom when, visiting Exeter 'in very secret manner', he was confronted with Rugemont Castle (closely resembling Richmond). Falling into a 'dumpe', he spoke of a 'prophesy once told him, that when he came once to Richmond he should not long live after: which fell out in the end to be true': Hooker, *op.cit.*, pp. 53-4; Holinshed, *op.cit.*, p. 421; for Shakespeare, see below.

24. Stow was a founder member of the Society of Antiquaries in the early seventeenth century.

25. Stow, *op.cit.*, p. 460; Hicks, 'Unweaving the Web; The Plot of July 1483 against Richard III and its Wider Significance', p. 107; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 149; T. Basin, *op.cit.*, pp. 234-5.

never well kept...'²⁶ Following the earlier chroniclers, Stow points the finger directly at Richard for 'the lamentable murder of his innocent nephews', and adopting the 'crime and punishment' cycle (and still quoting from More) he further blackens Richard; for 'all the time of his reign never ceased there cruel death and slaughter, till his own destruction ended it'. Finally the King 'finished his time with the best death and the most righteous...his own'.²⁷

As Horrox comments, Stow's phrasing in relation to the alleged plot indicates his possible use of the official indictment of the four rebels. This was not new. The chronicle sources, most notably the Crowland Chronicle, and the later Tudor writers also used official documents. But like the second continuator, Stow's brevity and lack of embellishments invest his work with a certain credibility. He may well have used official sources for his knowledge of the south-eastern sector of revolt. For example Stow was aware of trouble at Gravesend in early October, and at Canterbury in early November, which 'collapsed' only when news of Buckingham's execution became known.²⁸

Despite providing some new and interesting detail both on the intrigue from May and on the revolt itself, Stow and Holinshed contribute little to the development of the Tudor tradition. Conversely, the dramatist, William Shakespeare 'immortalised the Tudor legend for future generations' in his portrayal of Richard III. For the events which precede the revolt, Shakespeare used More extensively, and Holinshed (a redaction of Hall) while the latter and Vergil were his main sources for the rising.²⁹ Unlike Vergil, More (as noted) did not pursue the theme of Buckingham's moral regeneration. He is left at Brecon, disconsolate and in Morton's hands. So too, Shakespeare, while stressing the duke's anguish at the end of his life, does not develop this theme in the same manner or with the same conviction as Vergil and Hall. Yet Shakespeare's Buckingham is in great need of moral rehabilitation. Not only does the duke with Richard, play a large role, he is presented as the instigator of much of the action. His reasons for defecting from Richard are entirely mercenary - he wants the remaining Bohun

26. See Stow, *op. cit.*, p. 460, and More, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

27. Stow, *ibid.*

28. Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 155-6.

29. Shakespeare's Richard is More's Richard. And in a sense, More's Buckingham is Shakespeare's Buckingham. As A. Hammond notes, Shakespeare 'adopted a tone, a general approach, towards the subject', which was supplied by More. And while he amplified More's history, and excluded some of his sources, he remained 'true to the tone of the book: his emphases are More's'; see Hammond ed., *King Richard III*, p. 75.

lands. Richard, for his part, wants the death of the Princes, which he makes clear to Buckingham.

shall I be plain? I wish the bastards dead!

Buckingham hesitates:

give me some little breath, some pause dear lord

However his vacillation has nothing to do with morality or even squeamishness. Rather, the duke needs time to take stock of the situation. What mileage can he gain from Richard's revelation? Noting Buckingham's hesitation, Richard senses his trickery and in an aside:

The deep-revolving witty Buckingham

No more shall be the neighbour to my counsels

Hath he so long held out with me, untir'd

And stops now for breath! Well be it so ³⁰

30. In the next scene Buckingham barter for Richard's favour. His bargaining power rests on his compliance with the King's desire to murder the boys. His reward? the Bohun lands. Yet when next the duke meets Richard, and broaches the subject he is curtly dismissed. The King has heard that 'Dorset is fled to Richmond'. Buckingham rejoins with 'I hear the news my lord...What says your highness to my just demand?' The King, preoccupied with thoughts of Richmond, recounts the story of his journey to Exeter, where he was shown Rugemont Castle, by the city's mayor. This incident at Exeter, brought to mind the tale of an Irish bard, who had told him he would not live long after he saw 'Richmond'. While chronologically unsound, Richard's premonition provides a diversion which has a double impact, not only in view of his defeat in 1485 at the hands of Henry Tudor, but also in the light of Buckingham's imminent defection, which heralded the beginning of the King's troubles. Was Richard's biggest mistake in not placating the duke? Clearly Buckingham saw it this way: 'And is it thus? repays he my deep service with such contempt? Made I him King for this?' This is the essence of Shakespeare's Buckingham - the arrogant King-maker, piqued at Richard's refusal to grant him the Bohun lands. And the duke receives his just rewards, for Shakespeare lends him little defence. He does not develop the theme of Bannaster's betrayal in Buckingham's downfall, which is deliberately underplayed. Perhaps like Hall, whose treatment of Buckingham emphasised the wickedness of

In a departure from the sources, Buckingham's motive for revolt stems not from his revulsion at Richard's crime, but from his desire for his estates. And in stressing the themes of greed and power which fuelled the ambitions of Buckingham and the King, Shakespeare takes the corruption of the regime to new heights.

Unlike Hall's usage, 'Buckingham's rebellion' is not a device employed to exonerate the duke and further denigrate the King. If anything, Buckingham's role in the rising is additional and because of this, further inculcates him. This is evident in Shakespeare's treatment of the intrigue before the revolt, which is used as a backdrop to the tension between Richard and the duke. Unlike the histories, much is made of the threat from 'Richmond' in Brittany, which looms large. Against a background of growing unrest in which Richard's enemies are already plotting against him as he himself plots to kill the Princes, Buckingham's indecision (in the latter plot) anticipates his later action with the rebels. Yet initially, and reminiscent of the *Crowland Chronicle*, Buckingham is peripheral in the activity, and the revolt has a momentum which does not derive from the duke. Richard is made aware of defectors to 'Richmond', the Woodvilles, and later, Morton, and he is more perturbed to hear of the latter's defection than the possibility of the duke's.³¹ Even when confronted with Henry Tudor's

the King, Shakespeare (for the same effect) did not want to divert 'any great pity' to Richard's victims. Yet with an ironic twist, Shakespeare has Buckingham voice his own betrayal at the hands of Richard, while simultaneously implying the duke's penitence and employing the theme of divine retribution, inherent in Tudor historiography. At Salisbury on All-Soul's day, the duke, having been denied access to the King, lists the crimes (according to Shakespeare) in which both he and Richard, and then Gloucester alone allegedly participated: the execution of Hastings, the Princes, Grey and Rivers, Vaughan, Henry VI and his son, all killed by 'underhand, corrupted foul injustice'. The theme behind Shakespeare's use of All-Soul's day, or judgement day, suggests Buckingham's contrition; yet at the same time he will not forgive Richard, who is responsible for his end. 'This is the day wherein I wish'd to fall/By the false faith of him whom most I trusted'. In reality, Richard III on the eve of rebellion, voiced his own profound shock at having been betrayed by the one who 'had best cause to be true'. By employing the theme of divine justice, Shakespeare has Buckingham recognise that he must face the consequences of his behaviour: 'This, this All-Souls' day to my fearful soul/Is the determin'd respite of my wrongs:/That high All-seer which I dallied with/Hath turn'd my feigned prayer on my head,/And given in earnest what I begg'd in jest'.

31. 'Ely with Richmond troubles me more near/Than Buckingham and his rash-levied strength': Hammond ed., *King Richard III*, pp. 267, 269-70, 274.

invasion, 'Stirr'd up by Dorset, Buckingham and Morton', the stress is on Richard's mistrust of Lord Stanley, rather than Buckingham's 'leadership' of the rising.³²

Like his sources, Shakespeare focusses attention on the key personalities. Yet while the action still centres round the leading men, his medium allows a far more dramatic reconstruction of the rebellion than the histories. Hard on the heels of Richard's inquisition into Lord Stanley's loyalty, the King is informed of unrest in Devonshire led by Edward Courtenay and the Bishop of Exeter, 'With many more confederates in arms'. In Kent 'the Guildfords are in arms, and every hour/more competitors flock to the rebels'. As quickly however, the tide turns when 'by sudden floods and fall of waters, Buckingham's army is dispers'd by tempest' and the 'best news', 'the Duke of Buckingham is taken'.³³

Through his medium Shakespeare maximises the role of Richard III and the duke of Buckingham. From More, Shakespeare adopted the image of a demonic King, and dramatised More's characterisation. From other Tudor writers, most notably Edward Hall, he employed a thematic structure based on divine justice and retribution, within which he portrayed the dynastic struggles of the fifteenth century, beginning with the deposition of Richard II and culminating in Richard III's death at Bosworth, and the accession of Henry Tudor in 1485.³⁴ As he dramatised the character of the King, so too, the duke is larger than life. Like More's Buckingham, he is both grasping and ambitious, yet Shakespeare has the duke play a more significant role. While in both cases, Richard devised to take the crown and kill his nephews, More's Richard involves the duke only after he has both Princes in his hands, and his course of action has been decided. Conversely, Shakespeare presents Buckingham not only as an equal partner in crime, but an instigator of much of the action. Shakespeare, unlike Vergil and Hall was not concerned with Buckingham's moral rehabilitation. His treatment of the rising is not prefaced by Buckingham's catharsis with Morton in Wales. And though Richmond was 'Stirr'd up by Dorset, Buckingham and Morton', the duke's own rebellion was the consequence of greed and ambition, and he meets his fate, with anger, resignation, and only a modicum of contrition. On All-Soul's day, 1483, Shakespeare's Buckingham paid the price for his action, as did Richard III in 1485.³⁵

As a dramatist Shakespeare did not strive for an accurate reconstruction of the past; and though he used Vergil, More and Holinshed extensively, he 'played' with the facts and over-

32. *Ibid.*, Act IV, Sc. IV, p. 298.

33. *Ibid.*, pp.298-9, 301.

34. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth*, pp.17, 53.

35. Hammond ed., *King Richard III*, Act IV, Sc. IV, line 467.

worked his dramatisation. Influenced by over a century of historical writing, Shakespeare extended for his own purposes the views contained therein. For the present discussion, his treatment of 'Buckingham's rebellion' is significant if only for its strong emphases. The role of Henry Tudor, Margaret Beaufort, John Morton and the Woodvilles gained a new prominence; while his reconstruction of the plot emphasised the gentry's activity, and the threat they posed to Richard. Not concerned with morality and betrayal as they affected Buckingham, the emphasis is off the duke's leadership in the revolt, which was master-minded and largely conducted by the other main actors. In avoiding these themes Shakespeare, in his history play, accentuated far more dramatically than the Tudor sources, Richard's evil nature and wicked intent.

While Shakespeare avoided certain themes in relation to Buckingham to heighten dramatic effect, the Tudor ballad tradition which derived in the main from oral tradition, kept alive through the years such topics as the duke's moral awakening, revolt and betrayal. The stories surrounding the events of 1483 and 1485 provided generations with ample material to weave into verse and song; and, among a largely illiterate population, they commanded a ready audience. While the medium clearly encouraged exaggerations, additions and distortions, its contribution to the themes in question cannot be ignored. Ballads such as *Buckingham Betrayd by Banister*, *Murdering of Edward the Fourth his Sons*, *The Song of Lady Bessy*, *The Rose of England* and *The Ballad of Bosworth Field*, reinforce information contained in the primary sources, and add insights which reflect, at least, the development of popular opinion through the generations.³⁶

This is evident in the mid-seventeenth century ballad, *Murdering of Edward the Fourth his Sons*, based, most likely, on a 1612 version. By a 'professional hand' and in a 'business-like'

³⁶. See Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth*, pp. 10-11 and Appendix V: The origin of *Buckingham Betrayd by Banister* is uncertain. The ballad was set down in the eighteenth century; however elements suggest that it could well have derived from the early sixteenth century oral tradition; *The Murdering of Edward the Fourth his Sons*, probably extant in 1659 and based on a 1612 edition; the earliest surviving text of the *Song of Lady Bessy* is from around 1600; *The Rose of England*, is extant from c. the mid-seventeenth century though probably composed in 1485; a copy of *The Ballad of Bosworth Field*, survives from the mid-seventeenth century, but a synopsis of an earlier version exists from the late sixteenth century. *The Ballad of Bosworth Field* deals with relations between the Stanleys and Richard III and importantly provides a fairly credible list of over 100 nobles and knights who allegedly fought for King Richard at Bosworth; see *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript: Ballads and Romances*, 3 Vols, ed. J. W. Hales, F. J. Furnivall (London, 1868).

manner, Richard III and the duke of Buckingham are charged with plotting the Princes' murder implausibly before they meet Edward V at Stony Stratford. Although Buckingham's role with Richard is large, yet it is the latter who finds the means 'to work...[the] princes' death'. The influence of the written sources is clear. Adopting from Hall the 'crime and punishment cycle', the balladeer stresses God's vengeance first on the duke, who, having quickly fallen out with Richard, is 'forced to lose his head', and on the King himself who is killed by Henry Tudor at Bosworth; and so 'for shedding of these princes' blood,/ God caused King Richard to be slain'.³⁷ Following written tradition the 'crime and punishment cycle' extends to Buckingham, and reminiscent of Shakespeare, the duke, without moral redemption, is wicked to the last.

Conversely, in *Buckingham Betrayd by Banister*, the duke's revolt and betrayal are used to highlight Richard's tyranny and Bannister's perfidy. The implicit message is that betrayal of one's lord is a heinous crime; the more so given these particular circumstances. Buckingham's betrayal is also dealt with in *Lady Bessy* again to underline Richard's tyranny. One of a number of ballads which comprise 'the Bosworth Field and Stanley cycle', the plot centres around Elizabeth of York (in whom Richard III has more than an avuncular interest) and her appeal for help to the Stanleys. The latter are fearful that Richard will destroy them, and are warned, repeatedly, that he has already killed 'the best duke in all the Land'. Richard's role in Buckingham's death, in fact, forms a central theme of the first fifteen stanzas. Emphasis is placed on the position that Buckingham had attained in Richard's affairs, and Lord Stanley is cautioned with 'that duke of England, was as great with King Richard as now are yee'.³⁸ Ignoring the facts, the message is that the 'noble' Buckingham was undermined by a corrupt and evil King - a fate which could well befall the Stanleys.

While the relevant ballads must be treated with caution, still their importance derives from the insights provided into both Tudor and Jacobean attitudes to, and perceptions of,

37. *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 163-6.

38. *Ibid.*, pp. 321-323; for quotation, *ibid.*, p. 187. Another in the series of the Bosworth Field and Stanley ballads, the *Rose of England* deals in allegorical fashion with Henry Tudor's return to England to claim his right to the crown. While no mention is made of Buckingham's betrayal, this episode is brought to mind in a tale involving Ralph Mitton, the Shropshire sheriff who had escorted the duke to Richard at Salisbury in November 1483. The central theme of the tale is Mitton's service to the crown; refusing entry to Henry Tudor at Shrewsbury, Mitton declares he knows no other King than 'Richard now that wears the crown'. In the event, however, of Henry Tudor's success against the King: 'why, then I'll be as true to you, my Lord'. In this context, Mitton's part in initially refusing Henry Tudor entry into the town, and, by implication, his role in Buckingham's downfall, are vindicated: *ibid.*, pp. 187-8, 192-3.

Richard's reign. *Lady Bessy* (and perhaps *Buckingham Betrayd by Banister*) derived from an oral tradition, free from the influence of the written sources and Shakespeare. Together with the *Murdering of Edward IV his Sons* they reflect, not so much the divergent opinion concerning Buckingham's role with Richard, but 'hard-line' views on the King himself. The 'professionalism' in the latter, together with its treatment of the duke, suggest, perhaps, the influence of Shakespeare; yet Buckingham's 'soft ride' in *Lady Bessy*, may not have been representative of broad opinion, but a device which enabled the author to emphasise Richard's corruption. Most significantly, in the three ballads Richard III is portrayed as wicked and evil, and demonstrates, despite the work of Richard's early seventeenth-century apologists, the strength of the Tudor tradition.

While Hall, Holinshed and Stow denigrated the character of Richard III, they were not innovative. The basis for their characterisation is to be found in the earlier sources. The crime and punishment cycle first adopted by Vergil, and used by Hall and Shakespeare, provided a convenient vehicle for developing this theme, and for exposing the vices of rulers, and the weaknesses of their subjects. In this way the duke of Buckingham, in the hands of Hall, attained at his death a certain redemption, while Richard took sole responsibility for his action. For Shakespeare, the same concept enabled him to portray the corruption of the duke and Richard to the last. In the seventeenth-century revisionist history, Buckingham retains his prominence with Richard, yet the accent is on the wickedness of other leading players, easing the stress of guilt on the King.

This is most evident in the work of the first of Richard's serious apologists, Sir George Buck, who completed his history in 1619. Buck depicts Buckingham's own rebellion as the result of greed and ambition; the duke was not motivated by his own conscience, rather, his action was the culmination of his weakness and his easy seduction by Richard's real enemy, John Morton, Bishop of Ely.³⁹ In stressing Morton's role Buck minimises Richard's culpability, for 'the King feared Morton', who was not only treacherous, but also 'a subtle and chief persua[d]er of others'.⁴⁰ Seeking to absolve Richard, Buck portrays him as being almost cajoled into accepting the crown; a process in which Buckingham took the lead.⁴¹ Prominent at Richard's coronation,

39. Buck, *op.cit.*, Book I, p. 25. Although Buck finished his history in 1619, it was not published until 1646, see Buck, *ibid.*, introd., p. lii.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

41. On reaching London with the duke and Edward V, Richard declared his allegiance to his nephew. The lords, however, encouraged Richard's claim because Edward V was 'too young to govern his kingdom', and because he was held to be illegitimate. In view of this, and the Protector's refusal to accept the crown, 'the duke of Buckingham and some other of the more

the duke appeared 'most extraordinary rich and gallant' as he bore the King's train, and served as High Steward with rod and staff. And when the duke left Richard at Gloucester, Buckingham 'went a[way to Brecknock, very] well content, [as it seemed]'.⁴²

For Buck, the duke's role in persuading Richard to accept the crown makes his crime of rebellion even more distasteful. For Buckingham, 'together with his complices, pretended the [cause of their] discontent and mutiny [to be for the reformation of the ill government and tyranny of the King, and under that colour...they resolved to take [up] arms.'⁴³ Citing Richard's crimes as the catalyst in the duke's defection, following the earlier literature, Buck stresses the twin issues concerning the Bohun lands and the office of Constable, allegedly refused by the King. Noting also Buckingham's anger over Richard's breach of promise in the match between his daughter and Richard's son, (taken from More) Buck finally targets the real cause of the duke's revolt: his own desire for the crown.⁴⁴

Despite Buckingham's action however, Morton was the real enemy. For the duke having been entrusted with Morton's care, was made '...almost as bad and as false and as disloyal as [the Bishop] himself'. Indeed while Buckingham was attracted to the crown, 'he was not resolutely determined to make his claim...until he was earnestly persuaded by the factious and

ancient nobility...consulting these dangers..resolved to give timely remedy unto them'. While Richard worked to remove the Woodvilles and others he felt threatened the new King, the 'barons' clamoured for Richard's accession, and the 'very wise, honourable and well-spoken' Buckingham was appointed their spokesman. So persuasive was he that the Protector 'was much altered' and finally consented to the duke's request: *ibid.*, pp. 25-6, 39-43. Unlike Vergil and Hall, Buck maintained that Buckingham and lords temporal and spiritual put forward the notion of the Princes' illegitimacy. Attempting to exonerate Gloucester, Buck believed that 'all king Richard's guilt is but suspicion. And suspicion is in law no more guilt or culpableness than imagination'. Yet ironically Buck was able to justify Richard's execution of Rivers and Grey using the same logic. For the Woodvilles were 'men whom [Gloucester] vehemently suspected to be over-ambitious'; indeed, men who 'would have [removed the princes of the blood and at their pleasures swayed and ruled all things during the minority of the king...'

⁴². *Ibid.*, pp. 48-51.

⁴³. *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁴⁴. *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60; see also A.N. Kincaid's notes, 60-64, in Buck, *ibid.*, p. 261, for Richard's breach of promise, which, taken from More, lacks credibility. For Buck, Richard's crimes do not include the murder of his nephews, and he works hard to free Richard from blame in their disappearance; see for example, *ibid.*, pp. 55, 165, 168 and 172; also Kincaid's introduction, pp. lxxxix, cxiv.

sedition clerk, Dr Morton'.⁴⁵ While stressing the duke's deceit, Buck accents Morton's power in order to minimise Richard's poor judgement in promoting a traitor. Feeding Buckingham's ambition, Morton persuaded him earnestly 'to claim his title', which 'the ambitious and silly duke bit at...and swallowed'.⁴⁶ It also clears the duke to a degree. As Buck acknowledges, 'Morton made this duke a traitor and other good men he did to harm...' ⁴⁷ At the end of Buckingham's life, Morton rather than Bannaster figures in the theme of betrayal; Morton's success with the duke caused his destruction and the Bishop's advancement. Having netted Buckingham, Morton, 'under the pretence and colour of a Lancastrian title...persuaded and counselled...[the earl of Richmond]...to take arms and to invade England'.⁴⁸

While emphasising the role of Buckingham and Morton in Richard's betrayal, Buck also highlights other important rebels: Margaret Beaufort, Lord Stanley and Dorset as well as providing a list of the main gentry rebels. From Hall, Buck wrote of Buckingham's meeting with Margaret Beaufort, during which he recounted Morton's plan 'concerning the royal design of the earl her son for England'.⁴⁹ Margaret, stressing the bond of kinship between her father, the duke of Somerset and Buckingham's father, gave her assent on condition that Henry Tudor marry Elizabeth of York. Yet the 'cunning' countess had already enveigled the Queen into conspiracy using this condition as bait. In a departure from Vergil and Hall (and to highlight Morton's influence) Buckingham, rather than Lady Margaret's servant, Reginald Bray, made contact with 'the chief friends of the earl of Richmond': Lord Stanley, Dorset, Sir Edward Courtenay, the Bishop of Exeter, Sir John Bourghier, Sir John Wells, Robert Willoughby, Edward Woodville, Thomas Arundel, 'and others'. Buck's source here is Vergil, evident from his inclusion of Sir John Bourghier.⁵⁰

Significantly Buck is the first to mention a rendezvous site near Gloucester, where forces led by the duke in Wales, the marquis of Dorset in the North, the Courtenays in the West, Sir Richard Guildford in Kent, John Cheyney and other southern gentry were to march 'in all

45. *Ibid.*, p. 60.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 61-2; Buck follows More in this. Vergil and Hall stress Morton's influence, yet mitigate the duke's guilt through his moral rehabilitation, while Shakespeare underwrites the bishop's role and stresses the duke's artfulness.

47. See Kincaid's notes, 60-64, in Buck, *ibid.*, pp. 261.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 63.

50. It should be noted that Buck has used Vergil's list of exiles abroad with Henry Tudor, including Sir John Bourghier, to make this particular point: *ibid.*, p. 64; see above n. 22.

haste.⁵¹ Buckingham's manor of Thornbury in Gloucestershire had been at the centre of a conspiracy in August-September, 1483, information which Buck might have gained from official records. He was, perhaps, concerned to highlight the significance of the region and its centrality in regard to the leading rebels at Stafford manors in the West, and the role of Buckingham at Brecon, guided by Richard's 'real' enemy, John Morton.

Buck's slant on the period reflects his bias. Reputedly the great-grandson of a Ricardian who died at Bosworth, his work was the first real attempt to redress the balance of over a century of literature which incriminated the King. Unlike earlier historians he was less constrained by the political climate, reflected in his work. With the passing of the Tudors it was possible to eulogize Richard III in a way which would have been difficult a century earlier. In terms of the revolt, according to Buck Richard was well-placed for success, having 'good intelligence', 'a good army' and 'being an excellent captain'. As for Buckingham, an 'inundation' prevented his men from crossing the Severn; later, they 'forsook the duke and came away'; after defeat he was brought to the King by his 'false servant', Humphrey Bannister. Yet again the duke's 'unhappy end' was the result of Bishop Morton, who 'brought the duke] to destructi[on]'. As for the rebels, they 'fled...And all were glad to hide themselves'. Ignoring the steady trickle of dissidents to Brittany and later France, and the problems which beset the King in maintaining the country, Buck finishes his section '...and because ...all things have gone well [with] King Richard...we will close here...'⁵²

Buck's defence of Richard III inspired a number of eighteenth-century apologist works, including the history of Francis Drake, historian of York, Thomas Carte, *A General History of England*, (1750), Horace Walpole, *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* (1768), John Wesley, *A Concise History of England*, (1769) and Malcolm Laing, *History of Great Britain*, (1793). Undoubtedly Walpole's history was the most influential among them, gaining for him a niche among the venerated Ricardians - Buck, Halsted, Markham and Kendall.⁵³ However none of these works adds substantially to the historiography of the

51. Buck, *op.cit.*, p. 64. The detail on the rebel leaders is taken from Vergil, including the latter's comment on Dorset in the North.

52. *Ibid.*, pp. 64-5.

53. Jeremy Potter, *Good King Richard? An Account of Richard III and his Reputation 1483-1983* (London, 1988), p. 179. See also A. R. Myers, 'Richard III and Historical Tradition', *History*, Vol. LIII (1968), p. 192, and Ross, *Richard III*, p. xlix. Buck's work was responsible for drawing attention to the Crowland Chronicle. Walpole, Hume and Halsted drew on this source, particularly evident in the latter's analysis of the centres of revolt. See below and also Buck, *op.cit.*, introd. p. lxxxix.

period, and in particular, to the rising of 1483. Nor did the traditional histories which appeared, among them David Hume, *History of England* (1762) and John Lingard, *A History of England* (1819).⁵⁴

Two distinct camps emerged after Buck's defence of the King. Simultaneously new developments were reflected in the historical literature: the age of Reason with its contempt for the Middle Ages gave way to the age of Romantic Revival with its admiration for the period. The new approach to history was based on an increased desire for 'industrious investigation', and Richard's reputation benefited accordingly. At the same time there was a new emphasis on government records and private correspondence as a valuable source of historical information. In this environment Sharon Turner's *History of England during the Middle Ages* (1823), was well received. Attempting 'to reduce the obloquy under which Richard III' had 'laboured to its just proportion', it was followed by A. O. Legge's revisionist history, *The Unpopular King* (1855). The most influential work, however, was Caroline Halsted's two-volume biography, first published in 1844, in which her painstaking use of records and private correspondence is most evident.⁵⁵

Halsted seems to epitomise a sympathetic interest in Richard in early to mid-Victorian England. Like Buck over two hundred years earlier, Halsted stresses the 'evil' nature of Woodville designs in April, while 'Gloucester's conduct was open and honourable'...and there 'was no undue assumption of power' at this time.⁵⁶ Emphasising the political stability which characterised May,⁵⁷ Halsted notes that by early June 'some intimation of approaching danger seems to have reached...Gloucester's ear'. Hastings was beheaded, Morton sent to Wales, Stanley, Rotherham and others were imprisoned, while York entered the Tower with his brother.⁵⁸ Richard, whose conduct only a few weeks before was 'irreproachable', now 'yielded

54. Two works which attempted to reach middle ground in their view of the period are Rapin de Thoyras's *History of England* (1728) and William Hutton's *The Battle of Bosworth Field* (1788). In all the literature the emphasis is very much on the leading figures and the role each played in the conflict.

55. Potter, *op.cit.*, p. 193.

56. C. Halsted, *Richard III as Duke of Gloucester and King of England*, 2 Vols (London, 1844), Vol. 2, pp. 10-11, 15.

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 63-4.

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 73-87.

to the worldliness of a corrupt age...', and after 15 June 'the two dukes...no longer concealed their designs'.⁵⁹

According to Halsted, Buckingham defected because he coveted the crown.⁶⁰ Importantly, however, Halsted is the first historian to stress that the duke most probably spread the news of the Princes' death, to his benefit and Richard's detriment. Yet his hope of promoting his Lancastrian claim was soon dashed because of the sympathy of the country 'for the offspring of King Edward IV', whose support of Richmond would keep him ever 'in doubt of death or deposition'.⁶¹ For Halsted, like Buck and Walpole, Buckingham was responsible to a large degree for the events from early June. Unlike Buck who stressed Morton's part in Buckingham's defection, Halsted like Walpole (and reminiscent of Shakespeare's character) has the duke take responsibility for his own actions, the result of inordinate ambition, envy and greed.

While Halsted's emphasis is on the key figures, significantly her work is based on a thorough reading of the Crowland Chronicle, government records and private letters and papers, including those of Thomas Bodley, Sir Robert Cotton, Robert Harley, the Pastons and Plumpton, as well as the publications of the Camden, Selden and Antiquarian associations.⁶²

59. *Ibid.*, pp 55, 88. Halsted, keen to exonerate Richard in April, undervalues Buckingham's role in events after Stony Stratford. It was only with the death of Hastings that Richard showed a flaw, and Buckingham's sinister role in Gloucester's affairs became manifest. Noting Buckingham's part in the allegation of the Princes' illegitimacy, the aspersions on the character of the duchess of York and the plea to Gloucester to assume the crown, 'the indignation...heaped on Richard's memory...' ought to have 'fallen on the peers, prelates, and noted personages...who raised him to the crown', for in an age when kings exemplify 'the character of the times in which they live...Gloucester was neither more vicious nor more virtuous than...the people who chose him for their ruler'. Highlighting Buckingham's rewards on July 13 from the King to the 'most noted of his partisans', his defection, some weeks later, marks 'one of the most remarkable instances on record of the perverseness of human nature'. Motivated by 'selfish and ambitious views', Buckingham was worked on by Morton who was well aware of the duke's 'envious, jealous and fickle temperament'. Yet while it was the duke who most probably spread the news of the Princes' death, to his benefit and Richard's detriment, there is no solid evidence of the King's guilt in the crime, which, says Halsted, until fresh evidence is found, must remain a mystery. In addition, Buckingham's sponsorship of a kinsman 'to whom he was personally unknown', in view of his part with Richard and the rewards he received, 'defies solution!': *ibid.*, pp. 259-60, 267-71.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 238.

61. For Buckingham's spreading of rumours, *ibid.*, pp. 180-2.

62. Ross, *Richard III*, p. 1; Myers, *op.cit.*, p. 196.

Her use of the Crowland Chronicle is evident in Buckingham's rumour-mongering role, and in her analysis of the centres of revolt. While Buck and Walpole had also used the chronicle extensively, Halsted is the first apologist to place due emphasis on the independent action of the gentry in the counties, and to fully appreciate the size of the revolt.⁶³ From the Crowland Chronicle Halsted notes the fear for the Princes' safety of the people in the South and West of England, and quotes the continuator's listing of the counties involved.⁶⁴ While emphasising the part of the key players in fomenting sedition, she stresses that by 21 October, 'the greater part of the kingdom was in open rebellion'.⁶⁵ Following Grafton, (in this a redaction of Vergil), she shows that Dorset raised men in Yorkshire, while the Courtenneys and Richard Guildford carried support in the South West and South East, respectively. While Halsted's work still centres on the 'personalities' in the rising, her analysis of the revolt presages the beginning of a movement towards more modern political analysis.⁶⁶ In fact in the latter part of the century a number of important histories emerged by 'professional historians', who were more inclined than their predecessors to challenge accepted interpretations, and to base analyses on official material. This is evident in J. Ramsay, *Lancaster and York* (1892) in which he notes that the rebellion appears not to have 'originated with Buckingham'. It was 'in its inception a popular movement, as things went in those days'.⁶⁷

Generally, while historical writing was changing direction, it was largely the debate between J. Gairdner and C. Markham which injected new life into the two opposing camps - Ricardians and traditionalists - and inspired a number of twentieth century works on the reign. Toeing a traditional line, Gairdner's views brought a strong reaction from Sir Clements Markham, who conducted his argument with Gairdner in the 1891 edition of the *English Historical Review*. Markham's own work *Richard III: His Life and Character* (1906), was the

63. See Buck, *op.cit.*, introd. p. lxxxix.

64. *Ibid.*, pp. 178-9.

65. *Ibid.*, pp. 264.

66. *Ibid.*

67. J. H. Ramsay, *Lancaster and York* (Oxford, 1892), p. 503. Yet he goes on to link the county gentry with various factions: Edward IV, Clarence, the Woodvilles, or the Greys, 'aided by broken-down Lancastrians; "Sanctuary men"; and the like'. The rebels, determined to place Edward V on the throne, were stymied by Richard, who removed 'the ex-King and his brother'. Later, they rallied under the duke's banner in the name of Henry Tudor and Elizabeth of York. For Ramsay, like Buck, the duke was putty in Morton's hands. Yet, like Halsted and Hume, Buckingham did not rebel over the Bohun lands which Richard had granted him on 13 July; nor was it over the alleged marriage between his daughter and Richard's son. Unfortunately, Ramsay offers no more insights, and the duke's motivation is left a mystery: *ibid.*, p. 503.

strongest defence yet of Richard. It was hardly surprising that Gairdner, accused of excessive reliance on Tudor historical tradition, should lock horns with Sir Clements.⁶⁸

However scholars of the period remain indebted to Gairdner, whose insights, derived from scrupulous use of official records and relevant chronicles, provide essential reading. Based largely on the Crowland Chronicle and government material, Gairdner provides the first systematic discussion of the Princes' murder, the intrigue over the summer and the revolt of October. From the Chronicle he posits, 'it is unlikely that the boys were dead when Richard and Buckingham parted at Gloucester because 'plots were actually formed for their liberation from the Tower'. To prevent this, Richard had sent John Nesfield to guard the sanctuary.⁶⁹ In relation to the Princes' death, Gairdner scoured the Harley Manuscript 433, the Patent Rolls and other official records for recipients of grants or pardons, indicative of 'service' at this time.⁷⁰ Like Halsted and Ramsay, he has based his reconstruction of the revolt itself on the Crowland Chronicle, noting that a rising on behalf of the Princes was mounted in southern England involving 'cabals' organised for their liberation, from Kent through to Devon.⁷¹ Stressing its careful planning, the sectors involved, the date of general insurrection, and Kent's premature activity, Gairdner picks up the continuator's point that Buckingham was appointed leader directly the rumour of the boys' murder became known.⁷² Although not cited, Gairdner has used the Parliament Rolls for names of leading rebels, Dorset, St Leger, Stonor and Fogge, and their rallying points.⁷³

68. Using More, Gairdner stresses Morton's influence in Buckingham's defection - in first stirring up his ambition, and later, expounding his plan for Henry Tudor's accession. Dismissing Hall's claim of moral outrage at Richard's crime of killing the Princes, he uses the chronicler's account of the duke's meeting with Margaret Beaufort between Worcester and Bridgnorth, which brought to mind the various obstacles in the way of his own claim. Informed of the proposed match between Henry Tudor and Princess Elizabeth, later at Brecon, 'he finally came to the conclusion that by such a marriage the interests of the kingdom would be best consulted'. Following More and Buck, Gairdner presents Buckingham as an intellectual lightweight, a man who was manipulated by a greater intellect. His defection was the result of 'his deep dissatisfaction with the usurper, his knowledge of the murder, his own views upon the crown, and his willingness to abandon them in favour of the Earl of Richmond': Gairdner, *op.cit.*, pp. 106, 108-11, 116-7, 140-1.

69. Gairdner cites the Crowland Chronicle for both points, *op.cit.*, pp. 116, 127-8.

70. *Ibid.*, pp. 119-128.

71. *Ibid.*, pp. 117-8.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 133.

73. *Ibid.*

Able to round out the bare facts of the episode, Gairdner adds substance by highlighting the crown's response to 'Buckingham's rebellion'. Included are such snippets as the duke of Norfolk's letter of 10 October from London requesting assistance from John Paston in Norfolk; Richard's surprise at Lincoln, and his urgent request for the great seal from Bishop Russell, his chancellor in London; his call for assistance from York; his proclamations against the duke published at York and Hull, together with the King's instructions for the royal muster. He stresses Richard's shock over Buckingham's defection; and later the King's rather odd proclamation of 23 October attacking the morals of the rebel leaders, the rewards offered for their capture and the centres selected for the publication of the proclamation.⁷⁴ Following Holinshed, Gairdner cites Lord Scrope's indictment of the rebels at Torrington;⁷⁵ and later details the commissions issued to claim the rebels' lands, the participants themselves from the Act of Attainder, and, 'as remarkable evidence of Richard's weakness', a number of rebels who received pardons over the following months.⁷⁶

Most importantly, however, Gairdner is the first to stress the significance of 'Buckingham's rebellion' in terms of Richard's reign. While noting the King's easy victory over the rebels, Gairdner is the first to draw substantial attention to the role of the rising in Richard's downfall: the King's unease after the revolt, his trouble in managing the South, and the growing colony of dissidents in exile with Henry Tudor. Drawing largely from the Harley Manuscript 433, he details the oaths of allegiance required from the inhabitants of Hampshire and other counties; the orders against livery in Kent and elsewhere and Richard's own visit to Canterbury, a particularly worrisome troublespot. Gairdner focusses on the activity of Scrope and Thomas Wentworth sent to sea to protect the coastline from Bretons; from the Patent Rolls he notes the general muster called for the kingdom in March, 1484 by Richard, 'fearful of the rebels' invasion with either Breton or French assistance; and Collingbourne's treason with Turberville, which resulted in the former's death, inspiring 'sympathy for his fate, and hatred of King Richard'.⁷⁷ By November, 1484, Richard having travelled down from Nottingham to the City, had 'perhaps' recovered 'to some extent'... 'the goodwill of the people', at least 'the

74. *Ibid.*, pp. 130-6; Gairdner lists the centres of revolt in Kent: Maidstone, Rochester and Gravesend, together with Guildford in Surrey; Newbury, Salisbury and Exeter. The proclamation of 23 October was posted in all counties and major towns south of the Thames and the Severn - Herefordshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire and in the town of Coventry.

75. *Ibid.*, pp. 142-3.

76. *Ibid.*, pp. 158-9; Gairdner also notes the attainder of Walter Roberd, of Cranbrook, Kent, associate of Sir George Brown at Maidstone, who had sheltered rebels at his manor until c. 10 February; *ibid.*, p. 159; one of these was Sir John Guildford.

77. *Ibid.*, pp. 144-9, 167, 190-1.

mayors and aldermen'; but his popularity 'was by no means universal'.⁷⁸ Warning the mayor of Windsor to imprison agents circulating false reports of invasion 'invented by "our ancient enemies of France"', Richard prepared a proclamation against the rebels and on 18 December, 1484, issued orders of array for Surrey, Middlesex and Hertfordshire. At this stage, in fact, the King was 'trusting few', and could not 'suppress' the 'rumours and the whispers'.⁷⁹ And all the while, 'many of the gentry' were leaving England for Henry Tudor in France.⁸⁰

In broadening the terms of reference, Gairdner's work marks the first significant break from earlier histories and their preoccupation with personalities. The rebellion itself becomes a critical event brought to life by a fresh interpretation with new emphases and sustained political analysis. Gairdner's use of the Crowland Chronicle, the Patent Rolls, Harley Manuscript 433, *York Records*, Richard's own correspondence and the work of numerous antiquarians, has provided historians with a rich interpretation of the revolt, its aftermath, and its role in Richard's downfall. Interestingly, and in order to highlight its new status, Gairdner is the first to refer specifically to the rising as "Buckingham's Rebellion".

Gairdner's critics, particularly Markham, have attacked his use of the traditional sources, especially his emphasis on Sir Thomas More's *History of King Richard the Third*, from which he uses, at times, entire passages of invented speeches 'as factual quotations'.⁸¹ Markham, however, who relies heavily on Sir George Buck both in terms of structure and his use of the sources, has, ironically, coupled the latter with Hall, Grafton, Holinshed and Stow 'who copied from earlier writers and therefore cannot be considered authorities except when they introduce documents as evidence'. He 'proves' that Morton wrote More's history, and as Buck often cited his 'More' references as 'Morton and More', Markham goes one step further in noting all his 'More' references as 'Morton'.⁸² In refuting Gairdner's work, for Markham, almost all the sources were either 'suppressed or twisted to serve the conspiracy against Richard, mostly by Morton'. Like Buck, for Markham, Morton was Richard's chief enemy. 'Grasping and avaricious', Morton saw his chance to advance his interests on the death of Edward IV and threw himself into the Woodville-Hastings conspiracy against the Protector. Responsible for the death of Hastings, he also induced Buckingham, 'that weak nobleman to become a traitor'.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 193.

79. *Ibid.*, pp. 194-5.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 199.

81. Ross, *Richard III*, p. 1; Buck *op.cit.*, introd. p. xcv.

82. Buck, *ibid.*, p. xcv; see also Markham, *op.cit.*, pp. 252-5.

Having ruined the duke, Morton escaped abroad to work against Richard in Henry Tudor's conspiracy, which was engineered by the Bishop.⁸³

In the debate between the two historians, academic opinion, for the most part, favoured Gairdner whose work was more scholarly and whose knowledge of the period was greater than Markham's. At the same time, popular interest was fuelled through such a clash of ideas. In fact a division emerged around the turn of the century between 'specialist' and 'popular' views of Richard, almost akin to 'professional' and 'amateur' status. Popular interest in Richard gave rise to a number of historical novels which sought to rehabilitate the character of the King and in 1924 the Richard III Society was founded in England as a forum for the defence of Richard III's reputation; its success led to similar organisations throughout the world. The aim of the English branch is to 'promote in every possible way research...', and in recent years the society's journal, *The Ricardian*, has published numerous scholarly and elucidating articles as well as sponsoring a four volume edition of the Harley Manuscript 433.⁸⁴

In 1955 P.M. Kendall, one of Richard's staunch defenders, published his biography of the King in the first substantial work on the period since Gairdner's history.⁸⁵ Kendall stresses the ease with which Richard crushed the rebellion. Clearly not expecting a full scale revolt, Richard was caught off guard at Lincoln on 11 October. However he responded with zeal, and as events unfolded, he was able to advance quickly to Salisbury and on to Exeter, and as Kendall says was back in London just seventeen days later. Kendall's emphasis is on the key players rather than the gentry rebels. In fact the Woodvilles who 'dominated the movement...provided most of its strength, and directed its energies', were able to capitalise on the support of old Lancastrians like the Courtenays and Arundels, 'eagerly sniffing the air of

83. Markham, *ibid.*, p. 252; Myers, *op.cit.*, p. 203.

84. See Ross, *Richard III*, p. li; for works of historical fiction, Myers, *op.cit.*, p. 203.

85. Like Gairdner, he emphasized the crucial effect on events of the Woodvilles' opposition to Gloucester's protectorship, and their part in the conspiracy. The Woodville-Hastings plot, followed by the Woodville-Morton intrigue, became, some weeks later, the Woodville-Morton-Beaufort-Buckingham conspiracy. For Kendall, 'it is with the entry of Buckingham that the scene grows murky'. In true apologist style, Kendall portrays the duke as Morton's pawn at Brecon, and also stresses his probable role in the Princes' murder. For at Brecon, Buckingham was 'able to give the bishop assurances that they, [the Princes] were out of the way'. An ambitious man who promoted Richard's interests before the coronation, his avarice and envy most probably prompted his defection. Intent on the crown for himself, he succumbed to Morton's argument that Henry Tudor had the better claim, and led the rebellion to crush the King, shelving, for the time being, his own aspirations: Kendall, *op.cit.*, p. 267.

unrest'.⁸⁶ In terms of popular support, Kendall writes of the 'apathy or loyalty of the English people'; emphasising that 'great numbers' did not flock to Buckingham's cause, indeed that few of the commons had been aroused and those 'who had sprung to arms were quick to desert'.⁸⁷ These views are somewhat at odds with earlier apologists. Buck wrote that if the forces from the South East and West Country merged with Buckingham's Welshmen, then 'their power...[which] was so very great', was such that Richard would have been dealt 'a terrible and fatal blow', while Halsted, noted that by 21 October 1483, much of the country was in rebellion.⁸⁸

Despite, at times, his different style and emphases, Kendall builds on Gairdner's analysis of the revolt relying on the Crowland Chronicle, official records, and (unlike the former) Vergil and private correspondence, particularly the letters of the Stonors, Pastons, Plumpton and the *Norfolk Household Books*. Through these sources he amplifies Richard's response to the rising, especially in regard to the south-east sector, where the duke of Norfolk took command.⁸⁹ Like Gairdner (though with less emphasis) Kendall stresses the problems which Richard faced after the revolt. Using Norfolk's papers and the Harley Manuscript 433, he nevertheless contradicts some of his earlier comments on the size of the revolt and lack of 'popular' feeling. Aware of the threat of invasion, early in 1484 Richard stockpiled arms in the Tower, issued commissions of array in May, and 'kept his watch at Nottingham...until early November'. Noting that William Collingbourne's trial was the only indictment for treason cited in the chronicles, Kendall unlike Gairdner, ignores the steady flow of disaffected abroad and concentrates on other matters.⁹⁰

The new direction in historical writing which saw the traditional focus on 'personality' give way to a more critical approach to source material and sustained political analysis epitomised by Gairdner, resulted in the prominence of 'Buckingham's rebellion' as an important episode in itself. No longer used simply to substantiate a point in relation to the leading figures, Gairdner, and later, Kendall, developed the revolt on a number of levels, and in a wider context stressed its significance in terms of Richard's reign. Although, however, the rising attained a new significance and highlighted aspects of the period formerly ignored, both

86. Kendall, *ibid.*, p. 260.

87. *Ibid.*, pp. 273-5.

88. Buck, *op.cit.*, p. 64; Halsted, *op.cit.*, p. 264.

89. Kendall, *op.cit.*, pp. 270-1, and notes, pp. 481-3; for Richard's response, pp. 269-275. Kendall also used A. E. Conway's article, 'The Maidstone Sector of Buckingham's Rebellion, October 1483', *op.cit.*

90. Kendall, *op.cit.*, pp. 292-3, 300.

Gairdner and Kendall make little of the gentry involved, save the leaders supplied by Vergil or the Act of Attainder.

In recent decades, however, this situation has largely been redressed through a general process beginning around the 1960s, which saw historians' traditional concern with the image of Richard III as 'good' or 'evil', 'illustrious leader' or 'tyrant' give way to a more moderate stance, in which the King's strengths *and* weaknesses were reflected in his reign.⁹¹ The more moderate stance was inspired by a greater awareness of the reasons behind the development of the Tudor tradition, and a greater understanding of politics and society in fifteenth-century England. The emotive issues which had dominated historiography for centuries largely gave way to a new approach which aimed at discerning political, cultural or social patterns and trends within Ricardian society, and their importance within the late medieval context.

As a corollary, revisionist historians who took their lead from K.B. McFarlane began to focus on the gentry in fifteenth-century England. McFarlane's influential essay, 'Bastard Feudalism' (1945) focussed attention on the role of knights, esquires and gentlemen in the political life of the period, particularly from the 1450s and the intermittent outbreaks of civil disruption. McFarlane probed the role of bastard feudalism in the growth of political society, its impact on social mobility, as a catalyst in lawlessness and as an agent for magnate rebellion and social unrest.⁹² Bastard Feudalism, wrote McFarlane, sought to preserve not to undermine the ideals of 'responsibility, loyalty and good faith'. He came to believe that this system did not exacerbate aristocratic rivalry and he scotched ideas that it was the root cause of the 'Wars of the Roses'. McFarlane viewed the gentry as a resourceful class serving the nobility and the crown as lawyers, councillors, estate managers and soldiers. They were not puppets to be manipulated by magnates who needed large retinues to overawe the opposition. Rather, he was able to demonstrate that rich layers of gentry ability were used by lords only too anxious to

91. Generally speaking, from around this time the focus was no longer on the black and white debate which saw Richard III as 'good' or 'evil', 'loved' or 'loathed'. Instead he was viewed as a complex man with both human frailties and strengths: Ross, *Richard III*, pp. lii-liii; Ross observes that A.L. Rowse was the only historian to follow a more traditional line; see for example, A.L. Rowse, *Bosworth Field* (London, 1966), pp. 189-91. For a more moderate stance see Ross, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1976), p. 94; J. Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1981), pp. 217-232; A. Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1981), chapter 5. For a useful survey of the primary and secondary sources for Richard's reign, especially 1483, see K. Dockray, *op.cit.*

92. K.B. McFarlane, 'Bastard Feudalism', reprinted in *England in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1981), p. 31, and G.L. Harriss, *ibid.*, introd., pp. ix-x.

utilize their skills; indeed to offer 'worship', and 'to pay for the privilege'.⁹³ In turn, the gentry often owed allegiance to many patrons and in the majority of cases it would be impossible to determine the 'weightiest' connection.

These ideas have found expression in recent county studies and political histories on the second half of the fifteenth century. R. Horrox in a 1987 review article on the quincentenary publications, highlights C. Ross, *Richard III* (1981) stressing that most writers have been content to work within the political framework adopted by him.⁹⁴ Following Gairdner, Ross treats the rebellion as a major event in Richard's reign, and in a marked departure from Tudor tradition (and the majority of works before 1981) the role of Buckingham is minimised so that the duke appears to have been simply an adjunct to the real action. For Ross, 'the "Duke of

93. However see C. Richmond's article, 'After McFarlane', *History* (Portsmouth, 1983), pp. 57-9, in which he expresses concern over what he calls 'determinism' in a number of works in regard to retainers and retaining, in an effort by writers to come to terms with 'the complexities of political society (or social policy) of the period'. Among them, T.B. Pugh, 'The Magnates, knights and gentry', in *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509*, ed. S. B. Chrimes, C. D. Ross, R. A. Griffiths (Manchester, 1972), pp. 86-128. This is one of the works which, according to Richmond, underplays the role of the gentry. D.A.L. Morgan's influential article 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', *R.H.S.T.*, Fifth Series, Vol. 23 (London, 1973), pp. 1-25 is another of the works which underestimates the independence and power of the gentry; see for example, p. 24, in relation to Sir William Stonor and John Harcourt,.

94. Horrox, 'Recent Work on Richard III - A Survey', p. 283. For recent county studies and political histories see G. G. Astill, 'The Medieval Gentry: A Study in Leicestershire Society 1350-1399', unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Birmingham (1977); A.J. Pollard, 'The Richmondshire Community of gentry during the Wars of the Roses', ed. C. Ross, *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1979), pp. 37-56; see also M. C. Carpenter, 'The Beauchamp Affinity: A study of bastard feudalism at work', *E.H.R.* (London, 1980), pp. 514-518; M. Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wales (1981); I. D. Rowney, 'The Staffordshire Political Community 1440-1500', unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Keele (1981); see also Rowney, 'The Hastings Affinity in Staffordshire and the Honour of Tutbury', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. 57 (1984), pp. 35-45; M.J.Bennett, *Community, Class and Careerism: Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Cambridge, 1983); S. M. Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century* (Chesterfield, 1983); E. Acheson, 'The Leicestershire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century, c. 1422 - c. 1485', unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of New England (1989); M. C. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401-1499* (Cambridge, 1992).

Buckingham's rebellion" - is singularly misleading. For the risings were planned before Buckingham's adherence became known'; he offered his leadership late in the day, and 'very few of the rebels had any known connection with' him.⁹⁵ Ross also plays down the Woodville influence, which, while 'not unimportant', deflects attention from the strongest link among the rebels - their household status, as former servants of Edward IV.⁹⁶ Stressing their political independence, the gentry rebels were prepared to accept Gloucester as Protector, but not as King; their revolt was the outcome of Richard's usurpation, and the disappearance of the Princes. The original plan of 'Yorkist loyalists' to place Edward V on the throne, became a bid to replace Richard with Henry Tudor (when it became clear that the Princes were dead) through Buckingham's offer of leadership, and Henry Tudor's promise to marry princess Elizabeth to appease Yorkist opinion.⁹⁷ For Ross, Buckingham most probably rebelled because he was aware of the enormous opposition to Richard over his usurpation, which would surely crush him - as the king's closest ally - if he did not defect. Taking Halsted's point, it is likely that Buckingham helped spread the rumour of the boys' death to help seal Richard's fate, and secure his own pardon.⁹⁸

While stressing the common thread of royal service among the rebels, other factors are interwoven. Focussing on the independent south-east gentry, Ross emphasises the ties of kinship among men who 'belonged to a society tightly connected by intermarriage', and were therefore 'able to call upon the support of their kinsmen when they chose to rebel'.⁹⁹ However not all families reacted in this way, and as Ross further observes, kin were also 'divided in their allegiance'.¹⁰⁰ Yet the revolt in the Central South was also characterised by such 'loyalties'. Emphasising the 'Clarence' connection among the group, 'here again, family ties

95. Ross, *Richard III*, p. 105; see also A.F. Sutton, P.W. Hammond, 'Review Article: Richard III', *The Ricardian*, Vol. 6, No. 76 (1982), p. 24. Ross states that of the Kentish locals only John Pympe of Nettlestead had any 'discoverable' connection with Buckingham, yet this is incorrect: Ross, *Richard III*, p. 107.

96. Ross, *ibid.*, p. 105.

97. *Ibid.*, p. 113. While the emphasis is on Edward's former household servants, Ross also stresses the connections of some with the Queen's and the Princes' households: Nicholas Gaynesford, Sir George Brown and the Hautes, *ibid.*, pp. 105-7.

98. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

99. *Ibid.*, p. 107. As Ross notes, the Guildfords, Pympes, Darells, Poyningeses, Browns as well as Sir Thomas St Leger, shared kinship ties.

100. *Ibid.*, pp. 107-8.

probably played a part in spreading support for the rebellion'.¹⁰¹ In the South West, the marquis of Dorset and Sir Thomas St Leger, men 'who had close ties with each other, and equally strong motives for disaffection' led the rising. Interestingly, St Leger, 'who had everything to lose if Richard remained on the throne' was sufficiently 'well-in' with the regime to be included on the Devon subsidy commission of August, 1483.¹⁰² The Lancastrian element was, for Ross, also a factor. Disputing Kendall's comments that the Woodvilles 'dominated the movement', or that a significant number of the rebels were 'old Lancastrians' - still, men like the Courtenays had a strong incentive to rebel. Edward Courtenay, heir of the Lancastrian earldom of Devon, did not receive the title from Edward IV, and after the Readeption, Clarence benefited from these lands which became a source of royal patronage on his death. In the South West, the motivation of some is left as 'a matter of mere conjecture', while thirteen other rebels are difficult, Ross says, to identify.¹⁰³

R. Horrox is able to build on Ross's interpretation of the revolt in her recent work, *Richard III: A Study of Service* (1989) and in most respects she agrees with his conclusions on 'Buckingham's rebellion'. However Horrox's analysis in 1989 is different from her 1977 Ph. D. which separated the rising into three factions: Woodville, Clarence and Beaufort.¹⁰⁴ For Horrox, the Woodvilles and their satellites were 'systematically excluded from power', and it was the Queen's family and supporters, rather than Edward's household as a whole, who stood to gain by the restoration of Edward V. Yet unlike her later work, Horrox does not stipulate just how many of the rebels were essentially Woodville supporters and therefore excluded from power. In the main Horrox's rebels in 1977 were motivated by faction and loss of patronage. The rebels, closely linked through marriage ties were divided at times by local disputes which 'reflected in the division between rebels and non rebels in 1483'.¹⁰⁵ As for Buckingham, like Ross Horrox departs from the Tudor emphasis arguing that the duke's 'contribution to the rebellion was slight', and that he was motivated perhaps by the 'feeling that no more was to be gained from Richard'. The King, for his part, in granting the hereditary lands of Hastings and the wardship of his son to his widow rather than to Buckingham, may well have viewed

101. From Ross, the Clarence connection included Sir Roger Tocotes, John Harcourt, Sir William Norris and Sir John St Lo. For family ties, Harcourt was Norris's brother-in-law; Sir Richard Beauchamp was the step-son of Tocotes, while John Cheyney brought in his brothers, Humphrey and Robert: Ross, *Richard III*, p. 108.

102. *Ibid.*, pp. 109-110; C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 353.

103. Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 105, 110.

104. Horrox, 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', p. 52.

105. *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Henry, by the end of July as 'a threat'.¹⁰⁶ The duke perhaps read his mood, and 'in this context his decision to rebel becomes less inexplicable'. His defection could well have been the result of his own desire for the crown.¹⁰⁷

In her later study Horrox has modified some of these views. In fact, continuity of service both within the royal household and in local administration before and after the accession of Richard, is one of her main themes. By 1989, few Woodville supporters are believed to have lost patronage under Richard: Robert Ratcliffe and Robert Poyntz, closely identified with the Prince's circle at Ludlow, were replaced in land administration, while along with Rivers and Vaughan, John Forster, servant of Hastings, was dropped from the Hertfordshire peace commission after Edward's death. Yet these examples are hardly indicative of a Woodville purge. Rivers and Vaughan (later executed) were Edward V's closest councillors, while Forster, albeit the Queen's treasurer and receiver-general, was doubtless imprisoned through his intrigue with Hastings and the Woodvilles in early June.¹⁰⁸ In the Kent peace commission of 26 June, William Haute, brother of executed Richard Haute, was dropped, yet others such as John Fogge remained, while kinsman of the Woodvilles and future rebel, Sir John Guildford of Rolvenden, was promoted to its ranks.

Despite these changes, opportunism still plays a part in Horrox's interpretation of gentry motivation. Stressing (as in 1977) Margaret Beaufort's overriding concern, which was to see Henry Tudor on the throne,¹⁰⁹ yet minimising a 'Lancastrian flavour' to the rising, Horrox tends to see the motives of those rebels previously identified as Lancastrian, as mercenary. While Walter Hungerford prospered under Yorkist administration despite his family's Lancastrian allegiance, the fact that Edward IV and then Richard failed to reverse the attainders of his father and brother, 'may have triggered Walter's decision to rebel'.¹¹⁰ Similarly (like Ross) Edward Courtenay's Lancastrian motives are noted, and his dissidence 'was thus a straightforward piece of opportunism which ultimately paid off'. Like Courtenay, the Luttrells, who had forfeited their lands with the attainder of Sir James in 1461, failed to secure a reversal. Sir Hugh rebelled in 1483, and in Henry VII's first parliament, Sir James's attainder was reversed.¹¹¹ John Welles, Margaret Beaufort's half-brother, whose father and

106. *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 49.

107. *Ibid.*, p. 49, and n. C. Rawcliffe also shares this view: Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham 1394-1521* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 31-2.

108. Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 139-42.

109. *Ibid.*, pp. 150, 166.

110. *Ibid.*, p. 168.

111. *Ibid.*, pp. 168-9.

brother had been attainted in 1475, was, by 1483, a trusted member of Edward IV's household. But at the same time Edward had reversed the attainder of his kin, and for Welles and the others, pragmatism in 1483 played its part. In fact, 'for the first time in over a decade rebellion in pursuit of personal aims could be a feasible tactic'.¹¹²

Agreeing with Ross, Horrox states that 'fundamentally the rebellion came from within the Yorkist establishment'. In fact 'some of the rebels were associates of Edward IV who had lost heavily by Richard's accession', such as the Woodvilles and Hautes, whose revolt would not have surprised Richard. Yet dismissing an interpretation based solely on the 'outs' theory, Horrox notes that thirty-three of the rebels were justices of the peace, ten having been added by Richard, while three were sheriffs; some, including Hungerford and Thomas Arundel had benefited from patronage in the weeks preceding the rebellion. Like Ross, Horrox notes the moral outrage felt by the Yorkist establishment over Richard's usurpation. 'This is not', however, 'the whole story'. Reinforcing her earlier theme of opportunism, as with Ross, kinship and friendship played their part. Indeed, 'outs' such as John Cheyney and others including Roger Tocotes and George Brown, drew in family and friends. Moreover in Kent, and East Anglia the Woodville nexus drew in a group of 'interrelated families', while rebels in the other sectors provide further examples of kinship loyalties.¹¹³ Moreover divisions in local politics and wrangles over disputed estates may also have provided the impetus for revolt.¹¹⁴

As in 1977, Horrox feels that the Woodvilles still play a major role. In fact they probably formed the 'original nucleus of rebels', and were (as noted) able to draw in 'friends and kinsmen'. Yet it was not a Woodville revolt. Few were prepared to back the family in May or June, and it was Richard's usurpation which 'transformed' the situation. Again, while 'essentially a Yorkist affair', there were some 'Yorkists' who continued to serve Richard III. Yet again, others were induced by personal motives or 'pressure of circumstance'. Some, like Courtenay or Lutterell were 'reacting against Edward IV'. Unable to rebel during the stability of Edward's second rule, Richard's reign provided a vehicle for some to achieve their territorial ambitions.¹¹⁵

As for Buckingham, many of her 1977 views prevail. In opposition to the Tudor writers, 'modern opinion has tended to play down Buckingham's significance'. Like Ross, stressing the small group with Henry at Brecon, 'few of the rebels had close links with the duke, and 'by

112. *Ibid.*, pp. 169-70.

113. *Ibid.*, pp. 171-3.

114. *Ibid.*, pp.173-5.

115. *Ibid.*, p.176.

implication, Buckingham himself, seems not fully integrated into the rebellion, but peripheral in a political as well as a geographical sense'. In discussing the duke's motivation, Richard had effectively granted him the remaining Bohun lands, and unless he was angered by the King's grant of two important wardships to Katherine Neville, Hastings's widow, Richard had refused him nothing.¹¹⁶ Noting Buckingham's part with Richard at every step of the usurpation, she sees no evidence to support Hall's theory that he rose against the King after the murder of the Princes. However, 'given so many negatives', it is small wonder that some historians (herself among them in 1977) stress the possibility of Buckingham's own royal aspirations. 'On this interpretation' Buckingham joined the rising after the boys' murder had left the rebels without a claimant. And it is a moot point as to whether he would have supported Henry Tudor or asserted his own claim. While the contemporary sources and Tudor writers stress Buckingham's endorsement of Henry Tudor, perhaps this was an attempt 'to gloss over the sensitive question of the duke's title to the throne'. Horrox comments that Buckingham doubtless felt the rising would succeed and in order to protect his position, he 'switched sides'.¹¹⁷ 'Buckingham's rebellion' failed because of 'ducal cowardice' and lack of support. Stressing rivalries between the Stanleys, the Talbots and the duke along the Welsh borderlands, these families did not join in the rising. Ironically the revolt most probably failed due to Buckingham's defection.¹¹⁸

Horrox's contribution to the historiography of the period is considerable. While Gairdner drew extensively on the Harley Manuscript 433, Horrox's painstaking work on, and use of, the source is evident in the fullest account yet provided of the rising. In addition, Horrox has integrated much new material from the Public Record Office and County Record Offices, and is the first to access the work of Devon antiquarian John Hooker, used by Holinshed and cited by Gairdner, and to draw significant attention to an inquisition before Lord Scrope at Bodmin, Cornwall.¹¹⁹ Through her extensive research she has 'opened up' the topic, focussing on issues such as the rebels' patronage, continuity in household and local administrative positions under Richard, and the size, extent and duration of the rising. Horrox, in an earlier work was the first to draw attention to John Stow's comment on a July plot, which forms part of her commentary on the gathering clouds of opposition as Richard journeyed north after his coronation.

116. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

117. *Ibid.*, pp. 164-66.

118. *Ibid.*, pp. 163, 177.

119. *Ibid.*, p. 156; as noted Rowse, also cited the latter as part of a collection among the Borlase family papers: *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 111, n. 3

In between Ross's biography and Horrox's study, a number of books and articles made further contributions to the writing of the period. Two of the publications which celebrated 1485 are R. A. Griffiths and R. S. Thomas, *The Making of the Tudor Dynasty* (1985), and M.J. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth* (1985). Griffiths and Thomas chart the history of the Tudor family from their beginnings in early thirteenth-century Wales to their success at the Battle of Bosworth. In the context of 1483, Griffiths and Thomas highlight the struggle between Gloucester and the Woodvilles after Edward's death, the continuing insecurity of Henry Tudor's position in Brittany, and the fact that he did not, after the King's death, appear a greater threat to the Yorkist regime 'than in the past'. Yet this situation altered dramatically in a few months and by the late summer of 1483, Henry Tudor was 'the focus of at least two conspiracies against Richard' one of which was 'hatched' by Buckingham and Morton at Brecon,¹²⁰ while the other centered on the Beaufort-Wydeville connection, and is indicative of a 'Tudor movement' in the heart of the summer.¹²¹

-
120. R.A. Griffiths and R.S. Thomas, *The Making of the Tudor Dynasty* (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 86-9. Other quincenary publications include R. Drewett, M. Redhead, *The Trial of Richard III* (Gloucester, 1984); D. Seward, *Richard III: England's Black Legend* (Northampton, 1983); G. St Aubyn, *The Year of Three Kings* (London, 1983); *The Coronation of Richard III: the Extant Documents*, ed. P. W. Hammond, A.F. Sutton (Gloucester, 1983); *Richard III: The Road to Bosworth Field*, ed. P. W. Hammond, A.F. Sutton (London, 1985); *The Itinerary of King Richard III*, ed. R. Edwards, Richard III Society (1983); *Richard III and the City of York*, ed. R. Freeman, E. White (1983); *Richard III and the North of England*, ed. B. English (1985); *The 1483 Gloucester Charter in History*, ed. D. M. Paton (Gloucester, 1983); G. Waters, *King Richard's Gloucester: Life in a Medieval Town* (1983); *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre, Richard III Society (1983); *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (London, 1986); D. Rees, *The Son of Prophecy: Henry Tudor's road to Bosworth* (London, 1985).
121. The strands of disaffection were united through Reginald Bray, Margaret Beaufort's servant, with whom Morton managed to make contact at Brecon. For Margaret Beaufort, the disappearance of the Princes was probably 'the crucial factor' which altered her focus from securing for Henry his English inheritance, to 'plotting his accession to the throne'. Following Vergil, physician Lewis Caerleon was the intermediary between Beaufort, at her husband's London Inn, and Elizabeth Woodville, while former servants of Edward IV were drawn into the conspiracy through Reginald Bray. Hugh Conway, from the Stanley's domain in north-east Wales, was the agent chosen to take intelligence to Brittany, while Richard Guildford from Kent, and Thomas Ramney were back-up agents, sent directly after Conway: Griffiths and Thomas, *op.cit.*, p. 91.

Attention is drawn to Buckingham's alleged letter of 24 September to Henry Tudor, informing him of his own rebellion on 18 October, and inviting him to join in. Whether or not Buckingham would have supported Henry Tudor after Richard's deposition is impossible to answer, yet as Griffiths notes, Buckingham 'made no pretence of acknowledging Henry as the next King of England or of welcoming his marriage to Elizabeth of York'. For his part, Richard, already suspicious of the duke, summoned him to his side in September - to no avail. It was not until 11 October that the King could confirm his suspicions of the duke's defection. Detailing the leading players in the theatres of revolt, Griffiths, like Horrox, notes Buckingham's weakness in the Welsh borderland, and adds information originally supplied by Elizabeth Mores, a servant of Sir Richard de la Bere at Kinnersley in Herefordshire, which amplifies the account of Buckingham's downfall and his son's escape. Additional detail is provided on the associates of a number of rebels who crossed to Brittany in 1483-84, indicative of a powerful 'conspiratorial network', including 'Buckingham, Beaufort, Stanley, Wydeville and Edward IV's servants'. With a new slant, Griffiths comments that the failure of 'Buckingham's rebellion', and the duke's execution, removed 'at a stroke' Henry Tudor's only competition for the English crown.¹²²

As the Griffiths-Thomas study focussed attention on the position of the Tudors in English affairs to 1485, so M. J. Bennett in *The Battle of Bosworth*, highlights the key protagonists at Bosworth: Richard III and Henry Tudor, as well as the main power-brokers. In relation to the events of 1483, Bennett outlines a crescendo of activity which saw the death of Hastings and the imprisonment of Morton, Rotherham, Stanley and others, the removal of the duke of York from sanctuary, the deferment of the coronation until 9 November and the order for the execution of Rivers, Grey and Vaughan, all of which suggests that Richard, by this stage, 'cared little for legal niceties in his drive to take power'.¹²³ By 22 June, Gloucester, Buckingham and others, began 'to show their hand', exemplified by Dr Ralph Shaw's sermon at St Paul's, Buckingham's speech at the Guildhall on the illegitimacy of Edward's sons, as well as the son of the duke of Clarence, and the duke's petition to the King on 26 June. These events were capped by the King's coronation on 6 July. 'The usurpation had been planned and executed with precision and flair', and for the first few months Richard's strategem of rule based on a 'combination of fear and favour' met with success.¹²⁴ However, while London fell to Richard 'like an over-ripe fruit', the rot had already set in. Given that the actions of key players in the coup - Shaw, the Bishop of Bath, Robert Stillington and Dr John Penketh - are difficult to untangle, clearly, many dignitaries had acquiesced in the new regime through a misplaced

¹²². *Ibid.*, pp. 96-101, 107-9.

¹²³. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth*, p. 41.

¹²⁴. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

optimism, a need to believe in the 'rightness' of the coup, and, through fear. And if Richard seemed to have the support of London, 'in the first flush of summer', it was ephemeral; the false mood gave way to disillusion and intrigue as soon as the King left the capital. Taking a new direction, Bennett illustrates how the rebellion took place in the 'shadow' of Richard's itinerary north in the summer of 1483. Importantly most of the leading southern rebels lived south of his route to Gloucester. The implication is that rumours were spreading behind the King's back, and, in addition, that disaffection in other regions might not have had the opportunity to express itself.¹²⁵

As for Buckingham, it could well be that he played a crucial role in the disappearance of the Princes, and the denigration of Richard. In fact, important primary evidence to this effect may be Richard's own shock at his ally's defection.¹²⁶ Intrigue in the summer was followed by 'Buckingham's rebellion' in the autumn, which was triggered perhaps by his disappointment with the rewards he received for his role with Richard. Most probably, however, the duke joined the revolt 'because he believed that it had the strength to succeed, and because he knew that otherwise it would destroy him in its wake'.¹²⁷ Despite Buckingham's own rebellion, however, the activity of the gentry 'had a momentum wholly independent of the duke's machinations'.

Although R. Horrox's work marks the last significant contribution to the historiography of the rebellion, among the most recent scholarship on the period, A.J. Pollard's *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower* (1991) and M.K. Jones's *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (1992), contain some interesting observations. In the former, Pollard provides a synopsis of events after Edward's death, largely based on Mancini, the Crowland Chronicle and More's history. Of particular value is Pollard's discussion on the 'murder' of the Princes in which he draws together commentary on the likelihood of the boys' fate, as well as allegations from near-contemporary sources against Richard and/or Buckingham for the Princes' murder. Some of this material has been largely ignored in recent historiography such as the notes of the Bristol recorder, Robert Ricart, the Ashmolean manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, and the continental jottings of Caspar Weinreich of Danzig, Jan Allertz, recorder of Rotterdam and comments in *The Divisie Chronicle*.¹²⁸

125. *Ibid.*, see Map, p. 52: Ricardian England - Retainers and Rebels.

126. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

127. *Ibid.*, pp. 47-8.

128. A.J. Pollard, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower*, pp. 122-3.

Jones, with an interesting angle on 1483, draws on the St John's College Archives, the Westminster Abbey Muniments and the Calendar of Papal Registers, for his discussion of the Stanley-Beaufort marriage which brought Lady Margaret powerful new contacts in the form of the Woodvilles, and at the court of Edward IV generally. Through her position she was able to negotiate the return of Henry Tudor from Brittany. Her efforts culminated in a document written in Edward's presence on 3 June, 1482, whose main thrust was 'that Henry returned from exile, "to be in the grace and favour of the king's highness"'. In fact marriage between her son and Edward's daughter, Elizabeth was not inconceivable, and such talk had taken place in the late King's reign. In June-July, 1483, Lady Margaret conducted negotiations with Richard for her son's return. Yet the political atmosphere was electric, and although both Margaret and Stanley were prominent at Richard's coronation, the King was not sure of Stanley. For her part, Margaret, in London, quickly became aware of Richard's opposition in the South which she too joined, as he journeyed north. In all this, the communication Margaret had with Buckingham is ambiguous. 'It is difficult to countenance a situation in which Buckingham would have taken the colossal risk of rebellion to support the claim of a political unknown'. Henry Tudor's accession would have restored Woodville supremacy in Wales, 'at Buckingham's expense'. Citing the duke's alleged letter to Henry Tudor on 24 September, 1483, the former made no reference to the latter's prospective office; and it could be that Buckingham's summons to the local gentry at Weobley 'may have been with the intention of declaring himself king'.¹²⁹

From the mid-sixteenth century until late last century surprisingly little was written, and even less 'said', about 'Buckingham's rebellion'. The leading political figures have dominated the page and historians seemed content to use the revolt simply to underwrite their case. In this context Hall and Holinshed, following Tudor tradition, saw in the rising a device to accentuate Richard III's wickedness and Buckingham's contrition, providing William Shakespeare with rich material for his history play and the balladeers ample 'evidence' with which to entertain the generations. In view of the primary material which incriminates Richard, it is not surprising, perhaps, that the early traditionalists, who closely followed their sources, were preoccupied with the King and his court. It is interesting, however, to note that much of the 'new' information - such as it is - provided by the chroniclers, relates to the intrigue of 1483; for example Hall's comments on the Buckingham-Beaufort meeting in late July, Holinshed's information on the Torrington indictment, and Stow's evidence of the 'fire of London' plot.

¹²⁹. M. K. Jones, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 60-4.

The Ricardians' focus was also narrow, and the revolt used to suit their purpose. In 1619 Sir George Buck was concerned to exploit the same themes as his 'opposition' in defence of the King. For Buck, Morton was the real enemy who caused the duke to rebel and in this way the revolt of a leading nobleman against the crown could be explained. Buck also introduced new information on the rising from an unknown source in the form of a rendezvous for the rebels near Gloucester, before a major assault on the capital. Yet in terms of the revolt itself, precious little has been said, and for those on both sides of the debate, Vergil, the main source.

This pattern began to change from around the mid-decades of the nineteenth century, when renewed interest in the period coincided with a greater emphasis on official documents and private material. Interpretation broadened as old sources were scrutinised and new ones brought into play. The beginning of change is evident in Halsted's work on the rebellion, which she based on a thorough reading of the Crowland Chronicle, government records and private correspondence. As interpretation developed, the gentry were gradually accorded a new prominence and independence in the rising, so that by 1892 J. Ramsay could confidently assert that the revolt was essentially a popular movement. However J. Gairdner in his account of 'Buckingham's rebellion' most clearly reflects the new emphases, in which, to a degree, traditional concern with 'personality' is replaced by more broadly-based concerns and sustained political analysis. Importantly, Gairdner, in developing hitherto ignored aspects of the revolt, invests it with importance and demonstrates its significance in terms of Richard's reign, as an episode from which the King never recovered, and, by implication, a profound statement on the Yorkist polity.

Gairdner's influence on later historians is evident. While not granting the rising the same significance as Gairdner, P. M. Kendall in his 1955 biography of Richard, nevertheless developed many of the same points, and used the same broadly-based plan. Like Gairdner, Kendall relied heavily on the Crowland Chronicle, official documents, and Vergil. In addition, his extensive use of private correspondence, particularly the duke of Norfolk's papers, is mirrored in his detail on the regions of revolt.

The process by which the leading figures lost prominence in the historiography of the period received momentum from around the 1960s, when detailed research on the fifteenth century resulted in a greater awareness of the period and ushered in a fresh approach aimed at divining patterns and trends in a political, social or cultural context. Simultaneously interest in the gentry as an independent class was stimulated by McFarlane's work, which, in turn, led to a number of localised and wider-ranging gentry studies. This new interest and output is evident in C. Ross's work whose emphasis on gentry independence completely overshadows the traditional figures. Ross disputes Buckingham's leadership in the revolt, and his focus on the

gentry rebels as Edward IV's household men, reflects both their solidarity at court, and their power in the country. Linked through kinship and office-holding, yet not all the gentry rebelled against the new King's conduct; some had personal axes to grind and stood to benefit from Richard's overthrow.

These themes are also developed by Horrox, whose work demonstrates how far interpretation has developed between her 1977 Ph.D. and the publication of her study in 1989. In both works, Buckingham's role is minimal; yet in 1977 the rising was faction-dominated, evidenced by the gentry participants, some of whom had lost patronage under Richard. Bound by kinship and friendship, family disputes sometimes manifested on either side of the rebellion. In stressing continuity of service under Richard in her recent study, Horrox has altered some of her views. In the weeks which preceded the revolt few gentry were disadvantaged by Richard's accession, apparent in both household and county administration. Yet as in 1977, there are still some 'outs', others who were opportunists, some who used the central conflict to settle local scores, and yet more drawn in by family and friends. Importantly, Horrox has made a significant contribution to our knowledge of the revolt by focussing on its size, geographical extent and chronological pattern. Through her meticulous attention to official sources, coupled with systematic analysis, Horrox has shown that the rising was larger, more protracted and far more serious in its implications for Richard's reign than has hitherto been acknowledged.

For over four hundred years, most historians simply paid lip service to the gentry component in 'Buckingham's rebellion'. For the most part, historiography was concerned with the principal figures and the 'larger' concerns: the personalities in the conflict, personal motivation, the fate of the Princes and so on. Only over the last century have historians altered their focus in response to a changing climate which emphasised the importance of official documents, a thorough reading of the source material, and a more sober approach to historical analysis. Gairdner was the first to view the rising itself as a 'large issue', and not incidental to the real action. As interpretation developed both in response to academic fashion and new concerns, it was not until Ross's biography that the gentry themselves became the focus in the revolt. R. Horrox continued this trend, and through detailed research and sustained analysis 'Buckingham's rebellion' has been accorded a new status. Building on Gairdner's interpretation, both Ross and Horrox have focussed attention on the broader aspects of the rising, its place in Richard's reign and as the catalyst in his downfall. However, in regard to the questions: who rebelled, and why? there is still work to be done. In view of the importance of the event, the focus must be more sharply directed on the gentry - their background, wealth, and political

power - to fully appreciate their role in Richard's ruin. It is on these questions that the discussion will now concentrate.

PART 2

THE REBELLION

PROLOGUE

THE REGIONS OF REVOLT

At Lincoln when he heard the news of 'Buckingham's rebellion', Richard III made quickly for Leicester, strategically placed for the royal muster. This town held a host of memories for the new King. Only weeks earlier and in different spirits, Richard had spent several days here while still enjoying the early stages of his royal progress north. This was by no means his first visit. In 1471 Leicester had acted as a base from which Edward IV and Gloucester, just nineteen, could plan their strategy against the earl of Warwick, blockaded behind the walls of Warwick castle. Ironically twelve years later, Richard again at Leicester, prepared to meet many of the former King's southern servants some of whom he knew personally as the men with whom he had shared Edward's exile in those few months of 1470-1. Still unsure of the extent of the revolt, it might well have seemed to the King as if all roads in southern England, led to rebellion.

In the heart of the Midlands, Leicester and its surrounds were linked with the outside world by a mesh of roads, tracks and paths. Impatient for concrete knowledge of the rebels' tactics, Richard would have pondered various strategies and discussed possible routes along the main highways and backwater lanes which linked the Midlands - west and east - with the West Country and East Anglia, the southern-central shires, the capital and the South East. Pausing at Coventry on 24 October, if need were, Richard could strike at Buckingham in Gloucestershire by way of the road which joined Coventry and the Severn Valley.¹ Or, he could choose the old highway known as Watling Street (which ran from the capital through into north Wales) as far as its juncture with another ancient road, Fosse Way, which would take him into the far-west, by way of Cirencester;² again, Richard could follow Watling Street directly through to London, and on to the South East. As it was, the King planned to drive a wedge between Buckingham, Morton and the rebels in the far-west, and the other insurgents in the South, before turning his full might on the duke and Henry Tudor. Just out of Coventry however, Richard learned of Buckingham's failure to cross the Severn into Gloucestershire. Mollified by the duke of Norfolk's defence of the capital, and his son, the earl of Surrey's success in the South East, the King could turn his full attention on the South West. Accordingly, he altered his route and headed due south from Coventry, probably along the Oxford -

¹ R.H. Hilton, *A Medieval Society* (London, 1966), p. 12.

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

Salisbury road through North Tidworth and Hungerford, scattering before him the Newbury rebels, and on to Salisbury, which conveniently bisected the main centres of revolt.³

The roads which connected the disaffected areas had carried much traffic in recent days, as the rebels journeyed to their appointed destinations. Yet perhaps as early as August when plans were laid in the noble homes of the key players, and in the fine manors of the gentry leaders, Fosse Way and Watling Street formed part of the route which both carried agents to and from the Stafford estates in the South West and the west-Midlands, and enabled crucial information to be disseminated on the wider circuit throughout the South. In fact before the conspiracy gained wider currency, the leaders were well-placed to send and receive information around various parts of Buckingham's estates, with the duke at Brecon in Wales, Margaret Beaufort at Bridgnorth in Shropshire and Lionel Woodville at Thornbury, Gloucestershire; the latter in a crucial position, strategically, between London and Brecon, being close to the Severn opposite the port of Chepstow, and just twelve miles north of Bristol. Thornbury was also conveniently situated for communication with the other centres of rebellion - the far-west, Newbury, Salisbury, and through London to the South East.⁴

Yet by October, communications were more complicated than the rebels had planned. This was due to the action of some of the Kentish rebels who had begun to collect early in the month in an area known as the Weald, a huge woodland which sprawled away from the coast of Kent over into north Sussex, and down into Surrey and Hampshire.⁵ Their eagerness cost the rebels dearly, as the duke of Norfolk was able to inform the King of their plans by 11 October, a full week earlier than the rebels had anticipated. The unrest continued, however, and Norfolk despatched men both to Gravesend and Rochester on the 13th.⁶ The men of the South East had intended to march on London and hold it until such time as Buckingham, Dorset, Henry Tudor and the others could unite with them in a huge show of strength, which, it was hoped, would win the day. Despite their premature action, the rebels were able to assemble with their leaders at Maidstone on 18 October as planned; most probably joined by servants and tenants of the late Earl Rivers, from his nearby manor of Mote, before marching due-north, some eight miles, to Rochester.⁷ From here, they reached Gravesend, a further eight or so miles north-west, on 22 October. By now aware of Norfolk's success in fortifying the capital, they avoided London, and with Surrey and Lord Cobham hard on their heels, the rebels headed south-west

3. V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 3, pp. 254-5.

4. J.A.F. Thomson, 'Bishop Lionel Woodville and Richard III', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LIX (1986), p. 133.

5. V.C.H., Kent, Vol. 1, p. 471.

6. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 155.

7. F. W., Jessup, *A History of Kent* (London, 1958), p. 143.

for thirty miles, reaching Guildford in Surrey by the 25th. Gathering support and provisions, the insurgents could well have stopped at Buckingham's estate, Tonbridge, and a number of gentry manors such as Rolvenden, Cranbrook or Merton in south Kent before crossing into Surrey.⁸

The road from the capital linking Dartford, Gravesend, Rochester and Maidstone had facilitated direct travel for the King's agents and the rebels. Yet in their bid to escape, the rebels and their pursuers alike were forced to negotiate areas of the Weald which were often isolated from the outside world for several months of the year; and tracks which were little more than drove-ways for moving cattle to and from the upland manors to the Wealdon pastures; 'sad, deep unpassable road[s] when much rain has fallen' they could well have been almost impossible given the freak weather conditions.⁹ The rebels' mobility was further hampered by the swollen waterways: the Medway at both Maidstone and Rochester, and the Thames at Gravesend. Finding no respite at Guildford a number of rebels fell back on Bodiam in Sussex, and while some, no doubt, were more than ready to plead their case to the King's men, yet others remained disaffected as Cobham's presence near Canterbury in east Kent, early in November indicates.¹⁰

In the southern-central shires of Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Hampshire and Wiltshire, little is known of the rebels' activity, save that they were to group at Newbury and Salisbury on 18 October, before linking up with the other dissidents. In terms of communications, these regions were well served by innumerable roads and waterways which criss-crossed the lush and fertile country of the Cotswolds and the Chilterns, and the vast tracts of woodlands in Oxfordshire and parts of Berkshire and Wiltshire, linking the towns of Oxford and Newbury, Salisbury and Southampton. In south-east Oxfordshire, dissidents made for Newbury along the Icknield way, passing seats of prominent rebels such as Stonor, while others from Banbury, Deddington and

8. Rolvendon and Cranbrook were estates held by John and Richard Guildford; Merton was held by Sir George Brown. Sir John Fogge and John Darrell also had manors in the area, see *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 75-81.

9. This comment was made in the sixteenth century by Celia Fiennes : Jessup, *op.cit.*

10. *Norfolk Household Books*, pp. 471-2; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 155; Horrox stresses that 18 October, the date on which insurrection is believed to have broken in the various centres, could well be misleading as in Kent, for example, trouble erupted in early October; Richard was aware of trouble in the southern-central shires as a proclamation was issued at Kingston-upon-Hull, denouncing Buckingham. Horrox also comments that in the South West, trouble most probably began later than is generally supposed. Most historians have taken 18 October as the day of revolt. Certainly this is the date which Buckingham gave to Henry Tudor in his alleged letter of 24 September, and the date supplied by the Act of Attainder.

Chipping Norton crossed Akeman Street running east-west through the county before taking one of the many roads or tracks across the border, negotiating the river Witney at Stanton Harcourt or Minster Lovell. The Hampshire rebels reached Salisbury via the Winchester to Old Salisbury road, or came from Southampton and Southwick along 'good pack-horse' routes designed to cope with the heavy traffic from the textile industry. Still others from eastern Somerset and Dorset took a section of Fosse Way between Bath and Cirencester, which cut across into north-west Wiltshire, joining up with the Oxford - Salisbury route.¹¹

Yet the revolt in these sectors was almost a non-event. Alerted to trouble in Wiltshire on 17 October, the King was aware of rebellion at Newbury and Salisbury by the 23rd.¹² For the rebels the speedy approach of the royal host through the Midlands spelt both Buckingham's failure in the West and Norfolk's success in the East. And by the time Richard passed Oxford on 28 October and reached Salisbury on 2 November, the rebels, without options, had long flown.¹³

In the South West as in the South East, the rising was a more protracted affair. Again the Exeter rebels were to meet on the 18th and join forces with Henry Tudor, expected along the Dorset coast, at Poole or further west perhaps at Weymouth, before linking up with Buckingham's party from the Welsh marches, the west-midlands and Gloucestershire. In all likelihood conditions here were appalling. The recent torrential rain, together with the rugged terrain in parts of the West hindered the rebels' movements, and no doubt prevented some, from the more remote areas of Cornwall and Devon from reaching Exeter on time.¹⁴ Cornishmen from Helston, Truro, Fowey, Lostwithiel and Bodmin joined forces, travelling along roads little more than 'greenways' or unfenced grassy tracks made awash by the recent floods, before reaching the main road through the rich stannary districts of Callington and Liskeard, crossing into Devon over the flooded Tamar by way of New Bridge, and on through Tavistock eastwards to Exeter.¹⁵ Others from Plymouth and its surrounds took the main road through Tavistock, negotiating the Walkham and Tavy rivers at Horrabridge and Harford Bridge, which opened out to the central corridor of Devon, until last century, one of the main routes to Exeter from

11. V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 3, pp. 254-5; F. Emery, *The Oxfordshire Landscape* (London, 1974).

12. See above, Part 1, Chapter 1.

13. *The Itinerary of Richard III*, ed. R. Edwards (London, 1983), p. 9.

14. The storm which caused severe flooding was remembered in the area long after, and referred to as 'Buckingham's water'. These conditions together with the numerous rocky outcrops, hills and vales which characterised Cornwall and parts of Devon, almost certainly prevented some from reaching Exeter; see Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 104.

15. H.P.R. Finberg, *Tavistock Abbey* (New York, 1969); see map of Tavistock, Devon, pp. 40-1, and accompanying note.

Plymouth.¹⁶ Still others from the coastal areas of Dorset and Somerset picked their way through the flooded saltways, and on to Exeter as best they could.¹⁷

Raising their standard at Exeter, the rebels soon became aware that their plans had gone seriously wrong. As the days passed and neither Henry Tudor nor Buckingham appeared, the rebels dispersed. With the King's army approaching, a number fell back on Cornwall, taking brief refuge at gentry manors such as Cotehele, Boconnoc and Lanherne, before again unfurling their banner at Bodmin, in central Cornwall on 3 November. However they too were forced to disband, their leaders fleeing to Brittany to escape the royal host. Leaving Salisbury around 4 November, Richard had arrived at Exeter by the 8th, probably some days after his officials such as Sir Thomas Malyverer who was to watch the coast at Plymouth for signs of Henry Tudor, and John, Lord Scrope of Bolton, who took to sea having commandeered the Grace Dieu of Dartmouth and other ships for the purpose.¹⁸

16. *Ibid.*

17. Hilton, *op.cit.*, p. 10.

18. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 78.

CHAPTER 3

THE LAND, 1461-1485: KINGS, NOBLES AND GENTRY

'Buckingham's rebellion' was a dramatic failure. Yet while its collapse was largely due to premature action in the East, severe flooding in the West, and lack of coordination at the centre, initially at least, the plan must have seemed to its participants, water-tight. Before introducing the main rebel families, the following chapter will focus on the aristocracy of southern England and the power-structures of landed society. The most important estates held by the crown will be identified together with the features which promoted links between court and county, monarch and subject. Next, the holdings of the leading noble families (both resident and non-resident) will be explored, followed by the patronage dispensed to the gentry by the crown and the nobility. Finally the landed wealth of fifteen knights and esquires will be surveyed to gauge the type of wealth enjoyed by the leading gentry. The discussion hopes to ascertain the level to which the crown was a real presence in the South, and, in turn, the degree of political independence exercised by leading knights and esquires through their contacts with, and service to, both the crown and the nobility. Chapters three and four set the context for a quantitative survey of the rebellion and its significance. It is hoped that an examination of the power-structure of the South may indicate how the gentry were able to stage such a rebellion, and outline the sorts of social and political connections within the aristocracy which facilitated the framework for such a revolt.

For centuries southern England, compared with the Midlands and the North, has had the advantage of proximity to the capital. In fifteenth-century England the southern shires from Devon across to East Anglia, Oxford down to Hampshire and Wiltshire, and Kent through to Surrey and Sussex, all prospered through their closeness to the court, and the King. Proximity to court meant royal visits, and for the gentry the chance to make themselves known to the monarch. The possibilities of such an introduction were endless, and would lead, it was hoped, to royal patronage both in the county, and at court. Visits from Edward IV were especially welcomed, for the King was blessed with 'such a wide memory that the names and

circumstances of almost all men, scattered over the counties of the kingdom, were known to him just as if they were daily within his sight'.¹⁹

The Home Counties were best-placed in the South both in terms of their proximity to court and in the number of old crown lands which they held. Among the important castles and palaces which came to Edward in 1461 were Woodstock (Oxfordshire), Windsor (Berkshire), Sandwich (Kent), Guildford (Surrey), Winchester (Hampshire), Clarendon (Wiltshire), and Exeter (Devon). A number of these castles were used for recreational purposes, and like his predecessors, Edward often hunted in the crown forests adjoining his estates: in Oxfordshire the King favoured Cornbury, Wychwood and Shotover near Woodstock; in Kent, Eltham and Greenwich; in Wiltshire, Clarendon adjacent to the castle, and further west, Exmoor and Dartmoor in Devon.²⁰ At times these estates were used as venues for official business, providing a relaxed environment away from court at Westminster. At Guildford in August 1479, the King concluded a treaty with Maximilian and Mary of Burgundy for the marriage of his daughter, Anne, to their son, Philip.²¹ Just three weeks later on 7 September, Edward crossed into Sussex and spent five weeks at Chichester. Early in his reign, however, Windsor Castle became Edward's favourite residence. Drawn no doubt by the abundant game both here and at nearby Langley, this was the retreat to which he most often brought official guests including the King of Bohemia in 1466, Louis de Bruges, governor of Holland (who had entertained the King in exile in September, 1470), and leading ecclesiastics such as the archbishop of York, with whom Edward hunted in 1473.²²

Windsor Castle was prominent in the itinerary of both Edward IV and Richard III, who, like most Kings after their accession were keen to display their royal magnificence and to delight, as well as overawe their subjects. Not given to the long-distance perambulations of

19. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 153; see also D.A.L. Morgan, 'The house of policy: the political role of the late Plantagenet household, 1422-1485', in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. D. Starkey (London, 1987), p. 66.

20. V.C.H., Oxfordshire, Vol. 1, p. 375; V.C.H., Kent, Vol. 1, p. 472; V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 4, p. 442; V.C.H., Devon, Vol. 1, p. 1; V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 11; V.C.H., Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 563. For the various uses to which the royal castles were put see V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 211; V.C.H., Surrey, Vol. 1, p. 365; V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 4, p. 400; V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 6, p. 65; V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 10, p. 238. Legend has it that Wychwood forest was the meeting place of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville his future bride.

21. V.C.H., Surrey, Vol. 1, p. 365; V.C.H., Sussex, Vol. 3, p. 86.

22. V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 12; *The Travels of Leo of Rozmital*, ed. M. Letts (Cambridge, 1957), p. 55.

some of his predecessors, Edward IV, who visited York only once in the 1470s, travelled the South extensively often combining work with pleasure. Early in his reign he crossed into Kent through Sittingbourne, and on to Canterbury where he stayed from 14 to 16 August 1461.²³ Stopping perhaps at Eltham, Edward travelled on through Sussex into Hampshire, taking advantage of Porchester with its lush royal forest.²⁴ The following year saw him at Bristol (Gloucestershire), and later in the decade he spent time at Salisbury.²⁵ One of the King's favourite estates, Mortlake (Surrey) held by the archbishop of Canterbury, was visited by him in 1480 and on many other occasions.²⁶ In the same year he again stayed at Windsor, and either there or at Woodstock in the following year when he accompanied William Waynflete on an inspection of Magdalen College.²⁷

While Edward IV had been based at Westminster since the age of eighteen, it is difficult to know just how well Richard III knew the South before his coronation. Although he spent much of his twenty-six-month reign travelling southern roads, the records allow just the briefest glimpse into his affairs in the South prior to 1483. With a huge concentration of power in the North, he nevertheless had substantial landed interests in the South from the West Country through to East Anglia.²⁸ In addition, he was no stranger to London and at times personally conducted business with London's trading world.²⁹ In a political context Gloucester had attended his brother during the critical years, 1469-71, and had captured and tried dissidents and led commissions of array in the Home Counties and the West Country.³⁰ Yet from the early 1470s, his main preoccupations were in the North where he spent much of his time. In 1483, however, the King made some attempt to redress this situation. During the first leg of his royal progress north in early August, he visited the university of Oxford twice and spent several weeks in the Home Counties staying briefly at his manors of Greenwich, Windsor and Woodstock, and later at Minster Lovell, the seat of his close friend Francis, Viscount Lovell.

Clearly the country enjoyed royal visits. Whether catering for royal needs during a respite from court duties, supervising the more formal visits of the monarch to the university, or simply

23. V.C.H., Kent, Vol. 3, p. 294.

24. V.C.H., Hampshire, Vol. 3, p. 65.

25. P.R.O., E 404/28/89/28; P.R.O., K.B. 9/320; V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 6, p. 102.

26. V.C.H., Surrey, Vol. 4, p. 70; C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 192-3.

27. C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 211; V.C.H., Oxfordshire, Vol. 4, p. 20.

28. M. Hicks, 'Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the North', *Richard III and the North*, ed. R. Horrox (1986), p. 14.

29. See R. Horrox, 'Richard III and London', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 85 (1984), pp. 322-3.

30. See below, Part 3, Chapters 7 and 8.

providing the King with a grand welcome during his royal progress, town and county alike relished these occasions. Royal visits often resulted in patronage for talented subjects who caught the King's eye. And with an abundance of crown lands in southern England, opportunities were available for the King's subjects from the aristocracy to the yeomanry.³¹

Apart from the old royal estates in the South, a number of lands remained with the crown by right, such as the duchy of Cornwall lands and the duchy of Lancaster's southern estates. While the duchy of Cornwall manors were concentrated within that county, other duchy estates were situated in Berkshire, including the considerable lordship and castle of Wallingford,³² East Lydford and Stoke Beauchamp (Somerset),³³ Kennington (Surrey), along with lands in Devon, Dorset and Wiltshire.³⁴ Duchy of Lancaster manors were scattered across the southern counties, including Deddington and Broughton (Oxfordshire), Lambourne, Up Lambourne and Stalpits (Berkshire), Pevensey (Sussex), Enfield (Middlesex), Rye and Wheatenhurst (Gloucestershire), and Easterton and Everleigh in Wiltshire where the duchy had accumulated vast holdings in the fourteenth century, including the Salisbury and most of the Hereford fees.³⁵ By the fifteenth century these large feudal complexes were controlled, albeit indirectly, by the crown, and the South benefited both from royal interest in its duchy lands and the pool of preferment which they offered, including an array of offices from the

31. In relation to royal patronage of the aristocracy, see for example, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 243; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 367; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 4, p. 409; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 10, pp. 238-242; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 11, p. 110; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 13, p. 222.

32. Wallingford was the head of a considerable honour including manors in Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Middlesex, Surrey, Hampshire and Worcester, see *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 531.

33. *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, pp. 122-3, 239.

34. Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 79; *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 4, p. 57. The duchy bailiwick of Mere controlled manors in Wiltshire, Somerset and Dorset, see *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 5, p. 52. Far-flung duchy of Cornwall lands also included Byfleet in Surrey, Old Shoreham in Sussex, Isleworth in Middlesex and Maidencourt in Berkshire; see *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, part 1, p. 149; *V.C.H.*, Middlesex, Vol. 3, p. 103; *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4, p. 253.

35. R. Somerville, *History of the Duchy of Lancaster* (London, 1953), pp. 616, 619; *V.C.H.*, Oxfordshire, Vol. 1, p. 440; other duchy of Lancaster lands in Oxfordshire brought to the crown in 1399 were Chadlington, Fifield, Shipton, Kirtlington, Bletchington and Newington; *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4, pp. 253-6, 533; *V.C.H.*, Middlesex, Vol. 5, p. 224; *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 8, p. 98; for Easterton, *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 10, p. 89. Other duchy lands in Wiltshire which remained with the crown include Upavon and Manningford Bohun, see *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 10, pp. 163, 208.

highest ranking receivers-general, to the bailiffs and reeves. Duchy lands also meant patronage in the form of custodies, leases and direct grants to valued servants.³⁶

Needless to say the South West of England benefited most directly from Cornwall's duchy status. The institution stamped its own character on the county itself, 'making it more comparable to a palatine county like Chester or Durham, or like the principality of Wales', than any other county.³⁷ The administrative machinery for such an institution was complex, comprising a three tiered structure: firstly the local officials who supervised a single unit; next, officials in charge of several units, and at the top - the council, comprising the receiver-general, steward in chief and the auditors who controlled and co-ordinated the regional administrators.³⁸ In Cornwall the Prince of Wales as duke of Cornwall, by the powers vested in him, chose the sheriff, nominated a feodary, controlled the stannaries, and reaped the profits of excise on a number of goods, together with the profits of the hundred and county courts also under his control.³⁹ The importance of this royal connection cannot be over-emphasized. The reality of duchy status was 'court in county', and a corollary, 'county at court'. In the West Country, wealthy and talented aristocrats caught the attention of prominent courtiers close to the Prince. Favours here were translated in the form of duchy appointments affecting scores of people from the top officials to the local reeves and bailiffs.⁴⁰ Through such patronage the leading gentry, particularly, gained not just materially, but in terms of local power and status which key positions brought, and, most importantly, through their connections with those prominent at court.

36. For direct grants of duchy of Lancaster lands see *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 8, p. 235; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 9, pp. 176-78; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 11, pp. 109, 139, 145, 168-70, 173, 210, 240; *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4, p. 533; for duchy of Cornwall, see *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 11, p. 16; *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, pp. 122-3. The vast estates belonging to the duchies carried with them a multitude of offices, including the high-flying positions within the administration itself as well as the offices pertaining to the estates. Whether the crown was overlord or retained its duchy estates, positions such as receivers, stewards, keepers and bailiffs were plentiful. While it is not proposed to expand here, either on the range of offices or the patronage to royal servants, some examples in the various counties demonstrate the point; see for example *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 283; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 91, 132; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 11, pp. 109, 139; Somerville, *op.cit.*, pp. 418, 422, 608, 631. See also below, and Part 4.

37. Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 77.

38. J. Hatcher, *Rural Economy and Society in the Duchy of Cornwall, 1300-1500* (London, 1969), p. 77.

39. Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 80.

40. See below.

By 1461 Edward had also inherited numerous estates in the South, particularly in the South West and the Home Counties, both as the earl of March and the Yorkist heir. In the West Country his Yorkist legacy from Edmund Mortimer and Philippa, his wife, granddaughter of Edward III and daughter of the coheiress of the vast de Clare lands, was substantial.⁴¹ Many of these estates were settled by Edward on his mother, Cecily, duchess of York soon after his accession, including the castle, lordship and manor of Bridgwater in Somerset, the manor and borough of Newbury, as well as lands in Devon, Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Buckinghamshire, Essex and Middlesex. Together with her jointure these estates ensured that the duchess was one of the leading landholders in the South.⁴²

A number of boroughs, lordships and estates passed firmly into Edward's hands following the acts of attainder and resumption in the early years of his reign. The most prominent of these (apart from the duchy of Lancaster) were those of Margaret of Anjou including lands in and around Weymouth in Dorset, Milton and Marden in Kent, Feckenham in Gloucestershire, and the castles of Devizes and Marlborough in Wiltshire, together with crown lands which Henry VI had granted to his half-brothers, Jasper and Edmund Tudor, and the vast Beaufort estates. In the 1460s the King's brother, the duke of Clarence was the recipient of many of these lands, together with the forfeited estates of the earls of Devon and Wiltshire and Lord Roos in Berkshire, Kent, Wiltshire, Somerset, Devon, Dorset and Gloucestershire.⁴³ In Dorset alone,

41. In Dorset for instance, the King's lands inherited from Edmund Mortimer included the manors of Marshwood, Cranborne, Tarrant Gunville, Pimperne, Steeple, Wyck and Portland, together with the borough of Wareham and Weymouth; from Philippa he also inherited a great number of de Clare's Dorset estates, see *V.C.H.*, Dorset, Vol. 2, p. 141.

42. *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 47, for Bridgwater; for Newbury, *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4; for other lands, *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 9, p. 191; *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, p. 321; *V.C.H.*, Essex, Vol. 4, p. 105; *V.C.H.*, Middlesex, Vol. 7, pp. 15-16, 113, 143; *V.C.H.*, Middlesex, Vol. 11, pp. 13, 49, 147, 266. Edward's earldom of March lands in Gloucestershire were extensive and included Brimpsfield and Southam, and the following which the King settled on the duchess of York: Brimpton and Stratfield in Berkshire, Whaddon and its chase, Bierton in Buckinghamshire, and Barnsley, Lechlade, Bisley, Misenden, Winstone and Charlton in Gloucestershire, see *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 3; *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, pp. 139, 321; *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 11, pp. 13, 49, 147, 266. For patronage to leading servants from the March lands, see *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 4, pp. 404, 421, 426, 437, 439-40, 442.

43. The Beaufort lands in Dorset alone, which had descended from John of Gaunt in right of his wife Blanche, included Kingston Lacy, Shapwick and Maiden Newton, the chase of Wimborne Holt, and the hundred of Bradbury. Among other Beaufort lands acquired by Clarence was the borough and manor of Wilton, originally held by Cardinal Beaufort: *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 6, p.

Clarence acquired the castles of Sherbourne and Corfe, and the manors of Iwerne Courtenay, Wraxall, Chilfrome, Kentcombe, Mapperton, Wootton, Worth, and many more, all former Courtenay and Wiltshire lands.⁴⁴

His base in the Home Counties and the South West was further augmented in the early 1470s, when together with lands obtained through his match with the earl of Warwick's daughter, Clarence, with his younger brother, Richard, also received the newly forfeited Warwick and Spencer estates. The carve-up of these estates was of great significance; the bulk of Richard's lands were in the North, and it was from this time that he began to build up his power-base, consolidating his Neville estates with further royal grants. Conversely, Clarence became one of the leading landowners in the South, most particularly in the South West, where he received at least forty manors including Stokenham and Clyst St Mary in Devon, Tewkesbury and Earls Court in Gloucestershire and Canford and Poole in Dorset.⁴⁵ Through his

9; other lands forfeited by Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, which came to Clarence were the Surrey manors of Witley and Worplesdon, as well as Banstead and Walton-on-the-Hill: *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, pp. 64, 392. The Richmond lands of Edmund Tudor were concentrated mainly in Yorkshire, Hertfordshire and East Anglia, but also comprised a solid block in Sussex; see Wolffe, *The Royal Demesne in English History*, p. 153, Appendix A, pp. 241-2. The duke also obtained Stockenham, Yalmeton and the castle of Wardour in Wiltshire, the latter originally forfeited by John, Lord Lovell in 1461; for Devon lands see *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 70, 94; for Wardour, *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 13, p. 221.

44. *V.C.H.*, Dorset, Vol. 2, p. 142. For example Clarence received Margaret of Anjou's manor of Milton in Somerset: *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 4, p. 90. See also Wolffe, *The Royal Demesne in English History*, p. 107, n. 34. Devizes was granted by Edward first to Richard Beauchamp, bishop of Salisbury, then to Elizabeth Woodville. The castles in Wiltshire brought with them the forests of Savernake, Peversham and Chippenham, and the offices pertaining to them, which, together with the constableness and stewardship of Devizes were in the Queen's gift: *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 4, p. 409 and pp. 400-442, *passim*; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 10, pp. 238-42. It is worth noting that Clarence's duchy of Lancaster estates in the West Country comprised five castles and fifty-five manors in Devon, Cornwall, Somerset, Dorset and Hampshire. His estates in Somerset alone were worth c. £850 per annum. See M. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence* (Gloucester, 1980), p. 179.

45. In addition Clarence received the following: Chedworth, Stoke Orchard, Fairfield Tredington and Upper Court in Gloucestershire; in Somerset, a moiety with Gloucester in Long Ditton, Dinington and Somerton; in Buckinghamshire, Aston Clinton, Dundridge and Buckland; see *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 7, pp. 74-5, 167; *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 8, pp. 12, 131-2, 211-2, 229; *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, p. 134; *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 4, p. 148; see also *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol.

acquisitions in the West, Clarence came to lead a formidable retinue, and through the early 1470s he dominated political life in the region. The duke's pre-eminence here is implicit in a comment made by Bohemian baron, Leo of Rozmital (in the service of his brother-in-law, George, King of Bohemia) during a tour of southern England in early April, 1466. He described his visit to Salisbury, and the way in which the duke of Clarence hosted a lavish banquet. The latter's prominence here suggests his influence within the county both as the King's brother and a leading landowner.⁴⁶

By the end of Edward IV's reign, after Clarence's death in 1478, the Woodvilles had acquired a number of the latter's estates especially in the South West.⁴⁷ However their influence here in the 1460s was minimal. Although Elizabeth Woodville's dower comprised mostly duchy of Lancaster lands including a number of West Country estates, Edward's patronage of his wife's kin in the 1460s consisted mainly of providing them with profitable marriages, having, by 1464 largely dissipated those lands at his disposal in 1461.⁴⁸ Yet by

2. p. 192 and *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, pp. 313, 315, 329. Clarence also received a number of other estates in Somerset through forfeiture, including Henry Percy, third earl of Northumberland's lands in right of his wife, Eleanor Poynings, such as Charlton Mackerell in Somerset. Former Courtenay lands include Crewkerne and Ashcombe, and those of the earl of Wiltshire, Kingsdon and Somerton: *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, pp. 97, 114, 136; *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 4, pp. 11, 71; Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, Appendix II, pp. 206-7; see also *C.P.R.*, 1461-67, pp. 198-9, 212-3, 226, 328, 331, 362, 366, 388, 452-5, 484; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 88, 330, 457-8, 594.

46. See M. Letts ed., *op.cit.*, pp. 58-9.

47. It is interesting that many of Clarence's forfeited lands resided with the crown during the minority of the earl of Warwick, and although Dorset had received the earl's wardship, and Clarence's mother-in-law, the Countess of Warwick died seised of a number of the duke's lands held in right of his wife, yet the crown was in possession of the majority. The duke of Buckingham was the recipient of many of these lands from May, 1483. For further discussion, see below.

48. By 1463 Edward had endowed ninety-six subjects including nine peers, seventy-seven gentry and ten others, see M. A. Hicks, 'Attainder, Resumption and Coercion 1461-1529', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 3 (1984), p. 17, and in general, M. A. Hicks, 'The Changing Role of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, ed. C. Ross (Gloucester, 1979). The Queen's kin, her sisters - Katherine, Margaret, Eleanor, Anne and Mary, along with Thomas Woodville and John Grey, married respectively the duke of Buckingham, and the heirs of the earls of Arundel and Kent, Essex and Lord Herbert, the heiress of the duke of Exeter, and the dowager-duchess of Norfolk. For Elizabeth's lands see *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, pp. 197, 212-3, 228; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 94, 139, 179, 241-3, 260, 266, 297, 466, 483, 549, 560; *C.P.R.*, 1477-85, p.

1473 the Woodvilles had gained a foothold in the South West. The Queen's brother Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers became receiver-general of the duchy of Cornwall. In 1474 her son, Thomas Grey, promoted to marquis of Dorset in the following year, acquired extensive lands in Somerset and Devon through his second match with Cecily Bonville, step-daughter of William Lord Hastings and heiress of the Bonville and Harrington families. Dorset's grip in the South West tightened considerably, however, after Clarence's attainder in 1478, when he received the wardship and marriage of the young earl of Warwick, Clarence's son, and the custody of a number of Clarence's manors; and later, through the match between his son and Anne Holland, daughter of the duchess of Exeter and Sir Thomas St Leger, the King's brother-in-law. In 1483 the young girl was declared heiress to all the Exeter estates. Dorset's landed power is reflected in his appointments and he was both an administrator of Elizabeth Woodville's lands, and of the duchy of Cornwall.⁴⁹ The leading gentry, many of whom were retained by Clarence, benefited through Woodville lordship from the early 1470s and more especially after the duke's downfall in 1478.

There were, of course, many other nobles not as closely connected with the royal family who had a considerable stake in southern England. Yet by the early 1470s a number of the old aristocratic families including the indigenous nobility and others with large interests in the South, had suffered setbacks in the form of extinction and forfeiture. Among those attainted in 1461 were Henry Holland, duke of Exeter, the earls of Devon and Wiltshire and Robert, third Lord Hungerford, while the baronies of Botreaux and Bonville had died out both through attainder and extinction. Of the northern and midland nobles attainted in the early 1470s, Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, (executed after the battle of Barnet in 1471) had the most significant lands in the South. Of the resident nobles, the titular thirteenth earl of Oxford, John de Vere was attainted in 1475, and his title along with the earldom of Wiltshire (revived briefly in 1470 for John, Lord Stafford, d. 1473) lay dormant until 1485.⁵⁰

90; Wolffe, *The Royal Demesne in English History*, pp. 153-5; Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 37-8.

49. Hicks, 'The Changing Role of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', pp. 73-4.

50. Stafford was the third son of Humphrey, first duke of Buckingham. The earldom of Devon remained in abeyance (except for a brief period in 1469 when it was held by Humphrey Stafford of Southwick) until 1485, as did the barony of Hungerford. John de Vere, thirteenth earl of Oxford, attainted in 1475, had succeeded his father in 1462. Many of the earl of Warwick's estates (as noted) went to the duke of Clarence. After his attainder, a number of manors went to the marquis of Dorset, who held the wardship of Clarence's son, the earl of Warwick.

The fluctuating fortunes of the leading magnates after 1461 and again in the early 1470s resulted in a thinning of the ranks of the old nobility. In addition, several of the survivors such as Henry, fourth Lord Bourghier and first earl of Essex (d. 1483), and William Fitzalan, fifteenth earl of Arundel (d. 1487), were aged in 1483 and hardly dominant forces in regional affairs.⁵¹ Two points are significant. By 1483 power at the top and in the regions had changed hands. The Woodvilles (as noted) were pre-eminent, particularly in the South West, while John, Lord Howard (ennobled by Edward IV in the late 1460s) had become a major force in East Anglia and the South East.⁵² Simultaneously, the depletion of the old aristocracy sharpened a process which was not a new development, but was clearly exacerbated by events of the period. As power changed at the top, so too, within the counties, a number of rich local landowners of comparatively modest standing challenged the supremacy of many of the old and established nobles.⁵³ Increasingly through the period, a sizeable group of barons and leading gentry whose fortunes had been greatly augmented through the century, began to establish their own territorial power. Skilful marriage alliances, purchase and royal patronage had enabled the lesser aristocracy to build up large bodies of estates, which formed the basis of their considerable power.

51. The Fitzalan earls of Arundel were ennobled in the thirteenth century. William Fitzalan succeeded as the fifteenth earl in 1438 and died in 1487 aged seventy : *C.P.*, Vol. I, pp. 237-250. For the Arundels' wealth see C. Given-Wilson, 'Wealth and Credit, Public and Private: The Earls of Arundel, 1306-1397', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CVI, No. 418 (January, 1991), pp. 1-26. Receiving a baronage in 1348, Henry, Lord Bourghier was created Viscount Bourghier in the mid-1440s and earl of Essex on June 30, 1461 : *C.P.*, Vol. II, pp. 246-9.

52. Until the mid-fifteenth century the Howards were moderately wealthy landowners whose main interests were in Norfolk and Suffolk. It was the marriage of John Howard's father, Robert, with Margaret Mowbray, daughter of Thomas, the first Mowbray duke of Norfolk, which made the Howards' fortune. This was substantially augmented when Howard was ennobled by Edward IV some time in the late 1460s (the exact date is unknown). See M. Sayer, 'Norfolk Involvement in Dynastic Conflict 1467-1471 and 1483-1487', *Norfolk Archaeology*, Vol. 36 (1977); M. J. Tucker, 'The Life of Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey and Second Duke of Norfolk, 1443-1524', Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University (1962), pp. 3-4; J. M. Robinson, *The Dukes of Norfolk* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 1-6.

53. M. Cherry notes that by the 1430s four Devonshire families of non-baronial rank were among the wealthiest families in England. The regional supremacy of the Courtenay earls of Devon was challenged not by other nobles, but by families such as the Brookes, Dinham, Bonvilles and Fitzwarins; see M. Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wales (1981), pp. 4-9, 81, 88-9, 99, 105-117.

Before concentrating on these men, the discussion will identify important nobles from the North West, North and Midlands with lands and influence in the South such as Thomas, Lord Stanley and Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland; Francis Lord Lovell, Viscount Lisle, William Lord Hastings, the earl of Westmorland and William Herbert, earl of Pembroke (later of Huntingdon) along with Lords Zouche, Dudley, Mountjoy, Lovell, Morley, Audley, Ferrers of Chartley, Beauchamp of Powicke, and importantly, Henry Stafford, second duke of Buckingham.

Lord Stanley's main interests in the South before 1487 were acquired through his wife, Margaret Beaufort, the mother of Henry Tudor, whom he married in 1472. Through this alliance Stanley had access to his wife's Berkshire lands (a gift from her second husband Sir Henry Stafford, uncle of the second duke of Buckingham) and West Country estates, together with those in Sussex and Surrey such as Woking and Bagshot, in all valued at 800 marks a year.⁵⁴ The fourth earl of Northumberland had substantial interests in Sussex through his mother, Eleanor, heiress of Robert Lord Poynings. His father had acquired the baronies of Poynings, Fitzpayne and Bryan and estates in Suffolk, Norfolk, Kent and Somerset.⁵⁵

Along with his interests in the North and Midlands, Francis Lovell, the son of Northamptonshire based John Lord Lovell, held as his grandfather's heir certain Oxfordshire lands including his main seat of Minster Lovell. With manors in Berkshire and Gloucestershire,

54. For Beaufort lands see *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 3, nos. A 3989 and A 4045; see also M. K. Jones, 'Richard III and Lady Margaret Beaufort: A Re-assessment', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (London, 1986), pp. 28-9. By 1487, Stanley, then the earl of Derby, as coheir of the Rape of Lewes (along with Bergavenny and others) inherited considerable estates in Sussex; see *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 7, pp. 3-4. He also possessed numerous Somerset lands, as did his son, Lord Strange, see Collinson, *The History and Antiquities of Somerset*, Vol. 2, pp. 9, 84, 333, 351, 369; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, pp. 267, 351, 369.

55. E.B. de Fonblanque, *Annals of the House of Percy from the Conquest to the Opening of the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 1 (London, 1887), pp. 269-79; R. Jeffs, 'The Poynings-Percy Dispute', *B.I.H.R.*, No. 34 (1961), pp. 148-64, *passim*; Northumberland's Sussex lands included the manors of Kingston, Wick, Slaugham, Perching, Little Perching and Poynings (the latter inherited by Henry Percy fourth earl of Northumberland along with Twineham, Hangleton and Pangdean on his grandmother's death in 1484); see *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, Part 1, p. 176; *ibid.*, Vol. 6, Part 3, p. 162; *ibid.*, Vol. 7, pp. 183, 189, 203, 209, 213, 275. The Percies also held estates in Somerset and Surrey, see Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 59, 252; *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 324; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 195; *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, p. 97 for the fourth earl's moiety in Charlton Mackerell; see also *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 379.

Somerset, Hertfordshire, Kent, Surrey and Buckinghamshire, Lovell was also a substantial landowner in Wiltshire.⁵⁶ Others with possessions in the West included Viscount Lisle, while Lord Bergavenny (as coheir of his kinsman, the thirteenth earl of Arundel, d. 1439) possessed a block of estates as part of the Rape of Lewes (Sussex).⁵⁷ However it was the landed wealth of the most successful baron - the result of profit and patronage - which catapulted William, Lord Hastings from comfortable county squire to one of the wealthiest barons in the realm. Elevated to the peerage in 1461 Hastings held considerable estates in Yorkshire, Leicestershire, Derbyshire and the East Midlands. Yet his landed interest in the South was also noteworthy. Through his marriage with the Hungerford heiress he obtained the honour of Boscastle and six other manors in Cornwall, numerous manors in Somerset, while in Sussex he held the Rape and Honour of Hastings, and was lord of estates in Middlesex.⁵⁸

56. Lovell's grandfather was Sir William Lovell, seventh baron Lovell of Tichmarsh and Minster Lovell (d. 1455). Lovell's Oxfordshire manors included Charlton-on-Otmoor, Fringford and Somerton; see also *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 284 for lands purchased from Richard, duke of York. In Berkshire, Lovell held Upton Pole, Bucklands and the custody and honour of Wallingford Castle together with lands in Paworth; see *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 442. In Wiltshire he held at least eleven manors: Upton-Lovell, Knook, East Wanborough, Wanborough, Bridelhurst, Mannington, Wardenage, Hydes, Elcombe, Salthrop and Erdeskote; see *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 9, pp. 81, 176, 178; *ibid.*, Vol. 11, pp. 240-1; see also *Lincoln Diocese Documents, 1450-1544*, ed. A. Clerk (Oxford, 1914) for Sir William Lovell's will including the Kentish manor of East Wickham and the Surrey manors of Rotherhithe, North Crawley in Buckinghamshire, Widford manor in Gloucester and Bartley in Hertfordshire; for Somerset lands, Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 227; *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 55; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, pp. 167, 475; for Viscount Lovell's manor of Little Rissington, Gloucestershire, *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 6, p. 108; see also *D.N.B.*, Vol. XII, p. 172.

57. Viscount Lisle held five manors in Gloucestershire and Wiltshire: *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 8, p. 13; *ibid.*, Vol. 10, p. 209; *ibid.*, Vol. 11, p. 66; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 9, p. 122. Lord Bergavenny possessed seven manors in Essex and Surrey, and, as noted, was coheir of the considerable Rape of Lewes, see *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 7, pp. 3-4; for Surrey lands, *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, *passim*, for Paddington, Dorking, East Betchworth, Newdigate and Iwood; for Essex lands, *V.C.H.*, Essex, Vol. 4, p. 253; *C.P.*, Vol. I, pp. 24-30.

58. *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 9, p. 3; I. D. Rowney 'The Staffordshire Political Community 1440-1500', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Keele (1981), p. 132. E. Acheson, 'The Leicestershire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century c.1422 - c.1485', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of New England (1989), pp. 24-5. Hastings's Cornish manors as well as Boscastle (originally Botreaux) were Worthyvale, St Genys, Penhele, West Widemouth, Crackhampton and Pengelty, see C. S. Gilbert, *An Historical Survey of the County of Cornwall*, 2 Vols (London, 1817), Vol. 2, pp. 571, 576, 946; Hastings held at least six estates in Somerset, see Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 49, 73, 338,

By the early 1480s others from the Midlands had a stake in the South, such as the influential John, Lord Zouche of Harringworth, Northamptonshire.⁵⁹ A number of nobles with east-midland and marcher influence, such as William Herbert, earl of Pembroke, James Tuchet, Lord Audley, John Sutton, Lord Dudley, Walter Devereux, Lord Ferrers and William Blount, Lord Mountjoy held between them a sizeable block of estates in Devon, Dorset, Surrey, Sussex and Berkshire.⁶⁰ However the oldest and wealthiest noble from this region with the most substantial body of estates in the South was undoubtedly Henry, duke of Buckingham. As the direct descendant of Thomas of Woodstock, youngest son of Edward III, Buckingham was pre-

446; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, pp. 326, 342-3; for Middlesex, *V.C.H.*, Middlesex, Vol. 4, pp. 151; *ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 57. In addition to his own lands, Hastings had custody of the lands of George, son of John Talbot, third earl of Shrewsbury (d. 1473) influential in the north-west Midlands. For Hastings this meant at least four manors in Wiltshire and substantial estates in Gloucestershire, Somerset, Buckinghamshire and Berkshire: *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 9, p. 121; *ibid.*, Vol. 13, p. 44; *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 10, p. 86; *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, pp. 368-9, for a moiety in Weston Butlers; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, pp. 228-9; *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4.

59. John, seventh Lord Zouche held at least eleven manors in Somerset and numerous estates in Wiltshire, Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire and was overlord of considerable lands in the latter, Berkshire and Devon. For Zouche, Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 55, 87, 224, 324; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, pp. 32, 80-1, 193, 565; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 8, p. 223; *V.C.H.* Buckinghamshire, Vol. 3, p. 394; *ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 84, 112, 132, 277; *V.C.H.*, Hertfordshire, Vol. 2, pp. 188, 232, 367; for Westmorland, *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 520; *ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 314.

60. William Herbert, earl of Pembroke, held Tidenham, Gloucestershire: *V.C.H.* Gloucestershire, Vol. 10, p. 63; for Audley, *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 98; the manors of Somersbury and Shiere were granted to him by Edward IV in 1468: *ibid.*; see also *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 5, pp. 104, 193, and Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 3, pp. 254, 552 (Audley held three estates in Somerset). In 1466 Lord Ferrers acquired Hawkridge and Sutton Courtenay in Berkshire, forfeited by Thomas Courtenay, earl of Devon in 1461: *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 3, Vol. 4, p. 373; he also held Dorton and Hillesdon in Buckinghamshire, until they were restored to the earldom of Devon on Henry VII's accession; see *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 4, pp. 46, 175. Edward Blount, Lord Mountjoy held Northeye, Sussex, through his wife Anne, daughter of Thomas Cobham (d. 1471): *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 9, together with Rotherhithe in Surrey: *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 4, p. 87; Bourne Sayntclere in Sussex: *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 4, p. 129; Lymington and New Lymington in Hampshire: *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 4, pp. 645-7 and two manors in Somerset: Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 117, 262. Richard, Lord Beauchamp of Powicke possessed Boddington and Nether Court in Gloucestershire: *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 8, pp. 190, 212. Another non-resident noble with purchase in the South was Thomas, Lord Scrope of Bolton with manors in Buckinghamshire and Essex: *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, p. 48; *V.C.H.*, Essex, Vol. 4, p. 30.

eminent among the old aristocracy. With eight widespread receiverships, his lands in the West Country - in Gloucestershire, Hampshire and Wiltshire, in the Central South - in Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, and in the South East - in Kent and Surrey, were extensive. Although he favoured Brecon in south-east Wales, his manors of Thornbury (Gloucestershire) and Tonbridge and Penshurst (Kent) were also favourite residences. In the former, a number of leading Gloucestershire families such as the Berkeleys and the Poyntzes helped to manage his estates.⁶¹ So too, in Kent where Buckingham was overlord of Nettlestead (situated on the Medway, several miles from Maidstone) a number of old Kentish families - St Legers, Guildfords, Pympe, Scotts and Cheyneys of Sheppey, along with the Fiennes and Cobhams of Sussex - were connected with the duke as a leading landowner within their region.⁶²

-
61. Rawcliffe, *The Stafford, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, Appendix A, pp. 191-4, for Buckingham's southern estates comprising six manors in Gloucestershire, with the court of the Honour of Hereford and a number of courts leet, eight manors in Wiltshire plus rents from Great Bedwyn (along with minor judicial privileges) together with four manors in Hampshire (in addition Buckingham also held manors in Somerset, see Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 228; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 56 and the duchy of Cornwall manor of Calliland: Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, Appendix B, p. 203). The duke held at least nine estates in Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire; see *ibid.*, Appendix A, pp. 191-3, and for lands not listed in Rawcliffe, *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 3, p. 481; *ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 5, 41. In the South East the duke possessed seven manors and the castle of Tonbridge, plus holdings in Circleston, Oltham, Ormidale, Overford and Sedingdale, Northfrith Park, the court and Honour of Gloucester and tenements in Greenwich; in Surrey, the manors of Effingham and Ockham, the manor and borough of Bletchingley, and possessions in six other parishes (while Rawcliffe calls these lands and tenements, the *V.C.H.* describes Camberwell, Tillingdon, Titsey and Waldingham as manors, see *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 4, pp. 28, 324, 327, 329). Buckingham also held the manor of Walton, see *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 449. The duke's holdings in East Anglia were also noteworthy with at least fifteen manors in Essex and eleven in Norfolk and Suffolk, see Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, Appendix A.
62. W.E. Ball, 'The Stained Glass Windows of Nettlestead Church', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, Vol. 28 (1909), pp. 157-249, *passim*. As well as Nettlestead, Buckingham was overlord of Tooting Bec (Surrey - held by John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester), Ore (Sussex - Hall family); Bradenham, Chilton and Edgcote (Buckinghamshire - Sir John Scott, Thomas Englefield, respectively); Soberton (Hampshire - John Newport); Bobbingworth, High Laver, Otes, Little Laver, Enfields, Hayleys and Madells (Essex - Walter Wrytell, Sir John Sulyard, Sir Robert Billesdon, respectively); Rendcombe (Gloucestershire - John de la Mare); Smallbrook, Tollard Govis (Wiltshire - John Rogers, John Savage, respectively); see *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 4, p. 94; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 9, p. 87; *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, p. 36; Vol. 4, pp. 24, 169; *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 3, p. 258; *V.C.H.*,

By early 1483 Buckingham was also connected with some of the wealthiest noble families in the South including the duke of Suffolk and the earl of Arundel, as well as prominent courtiers such as the upwardly mobile John, Lord Howard.⁶³ Suffolk's interests were divided between Norfolk and Suffolk and the Central South, particularly Oxfordshire, the county of his main seat, Ewelme, and Berkshire, where he held thirteen manors. His father, William, first duke of Suffolk had married the wealthy heiress Alice Chaucer, and 'for love of her...fell much to dwell in Oxfordshire and Berkshire'. His son followed suit.⁶⁴ Like the first duke of Suffolk, Arundel's match (with Joan Neville, eldest of the earl of Salisbury's daughters) consolidated his fortunes and with extensive estates in Norfolk and Suffolk, he also accumulated wealth in Sussex, where he held at least eighteen manors.⁶⁵ The career of Arundel's kinsman, John Howard, was, until the accession of Richard III, similar to that of Lord Hastings. Like Hastings, Howard's family were moderately wealthy gentry whose interests lay mainly in Norfolk and Suffolk. Again like Hastings, service to Edward IV brought a welter of rewards including offices, grants and a baronage in the late 1460s, which shot him quickly

Essex, Vol. 4, pp. 11, 88, 91, 98; *ibid.*, Vol. 5, p. 125; *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 7, p. 221; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 8, p. 102; *ibid.*, Vol. 13, p. 83.

63. T. W. King ed., 'Some Observations relating to Four Deeds from the Muniment Room of Maxstoke Castle, co. Warwick', *Archaeologia* 38 (1860), p. 278. Suffolk, Arundel and Howard were among the duke's trustees for certain of his Warwickshire lands in 1481, including the castle and manor of Maxstoke. Other dignitaries included in the grant were the archbishops of York and Canterbury, the bishops of Ely, Durham, Lichfield and Lincoln, the earl of Essex and Lords Hastings and Ferrers. Sixteen of the duke's trustees were prominent gentry: knights, Thomas Burgh, Thomas Vaughan, Thomas Montgomery, William Knyvet, Richard Choke, Guy Fairfax; lawyers Richard Pigot and John Catesby along with William Paston, John Denton, William and Richard Harper, John Brown, Richard Isham and Andrew Dymmock.
64. The wealth Alice Chaucer brought to her husband was considerable, and 'some say' her father was 'a merchant man, and bought a £1000 lands by the year': *Leland's Itinerary in England and Wales*, ed. J. M. Cohen (London, 1964), Vol. 1, pp. 112-3. For Suffolk's Oxfordshire lands, *V.C.H.*, Oxfordshire, Vol. 1, p. 440; *ibid.*, Vol. 5, pp. 140, 240, 296. For the duke's Berkshire lands, *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 332; *ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 62, 100, 242, 287-88, 346, 386, 464; *C.P.*, Vol. XII, Part I, pp. 446-50. Despite this concentration in East Anglia and the Central South, Suffolk held estates in Cornwall and Somerset; see Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 611 and Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 334. In addition, John, duke of Suffolk was granted the wardship of Francis, Lord Lovell.
65. For William FitzAlan, earl of Arundel's Sussex lands see *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 4, pp. 59, 66, 85, 90, 95, 97, 109, 111, 118, 122, 127, 144, 153, 178; *ibid.*, Vol. 6, Part 1, p. 149. The wealth of the Fitzalans in the fourteenth century was enormous. At his death in 1376, Richard Fitzalan, earl of Arundel and Surrey, left £60,240 in hard cash; see Given-Wilson, *op.cit.*, p. 1.

into the spotlight as one of Edward's favoured servants and a leading landowner in his own right.⁶⁶

Yet a number of barons were not far behind the wealth of the established nobles and prominent courtiers. In the South East, the elderly Richard Fiennes, Lord Dacre and Thomas, Lord Hoo and Hastings, were newly ennobled; Hoo, of Luton-Hoo, Bedfordshire, in 1447, and Fiennes in 1458, in right of his wife, the heiress of Thomas, Lord Dacre of Gilsland, Cumberland. Both men had large holdings in East Anglia and Sussex, where the latter held fourteen manors, while his Norfolk and Suffolk estates were worth £68 a year. Like Dacre, Hoo married well and through his wife, the widow of East Anglian Sir Robert D'Ufford, secured his place among the leading landowners.⁶⁷ Foremost among the barons from this region, however, John, Lord Cobham from one of the oldest and most eminent families (ennobled in 1313), dominated in the South East. Joan, daughter and heiress of John Lord Cobham married Sir Thomas Brooke of Somerset and Devon, an ancient and wealthy West Country family.⁶⁸ By the 1450s their son, Edward Lord Cobham had transferred his interests from the South West to the

⁶⁶. Lord Howard was the son of Sir Robert Howard of Stoke Neyland, Suffolk. His connection with the earl of Arundel and the Mowbray duke of Norfolk (as noted above) transpired through his father's marriage with Margaret, daughter of Thomas Mowbray, duke of Norfolk (and Lord Segrave and Mowbray), and kinswoman of the sister of the earl of Arundel (d. 1415): *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 7, pp. 3-5. Howard's patronage from Richard III will be discussed later. However, early in Edward IV's reign he obtained the manors of Leyham and Wherestede in Suffolk; Smethton Hall, Essex; Dontish and Dewlish, Dorset; Hereford manor and Meyton Hall, Norfolk, and two tenements in London. He received forfeited de Vere (earl of Oxford) lands in the 1470s in Suffolk and Essex, see Tucker, *op.cit.*, pp. 11, 21.

⁶⁷. For Richard Fiennes, Lord Dacre, *C.P.*, Vol. IV, Part 1; *C.I.P.M.*, nos. 189, 190, 261, 336, 392, 662; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 7, pp. 36, 114, 116-7, 175, 177, 213; *ibid.*, Vol. 9, pp. 133, 139, 266; for Thomas, Lord Hoo, *C.P.*, Vol. VI, p. 562; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, Part 2. His manors included Itchingfield, Fairlight, Tottingworth, Burghurst, Dallington, Wartling and Moorhall; see *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, Part 2 and *ibid.*, Vol. 9. George Neville, Lord Bergavenny (d. 1496), originally from the North, but most often in the South, was also a wealthy landowner in the South East. Bergavenny had inherited the Rape of Lewes in Sussex and much of his time was spent there. He directed in his will to be buried at his seat, Lewes; see *P.R.O.*, Prob 11/11 fos. 66r-67r; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 7, pp. 3-4, 70, 104-6, 157, 195. His Surrey lands included the manors of Paddington, East Betchworth, Newdigate and Iwood, together with a moiety in Dorking, see *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, *passim*.

⁶⁸. *C.P.*, Vol. III, pp. 343-6.

seat of Cobham, Kent, where his son John fifth Lord Cobham succeeded in 1464.⁶⁹ Pre-eminent among the leading landed families, the Cobhams aggrandized themselves through selective matches which linked them to lords Audley, Bergavenny and Howard. In the 1430s the West Country estates of the Brookes were valued at more than £432 per annum, second only to the Courtenay earls of Devon. Added to these, the Cobhams' own block of land in Kent and Surrey, ensured that the fifth lord was one of the South's leading young barons.⁷⁰

Like Cobham, the West Country lords, Stourton, Lawarre and Dinham were also landowners of great wealth. Among the oldest of the Wiltshire families, twenty-four-year old John third Lord Stourton succeeded his father in 1477. Matches through the centuries with solid gentry families such as the Wadhams, Wrottesleys, Chidiocks, Daubenays, Berkeleys and Cheneyes had increased their considerable holdings in the South West. Kinsman of the Beauchamps and Beauforts, the cornerstone of Stourton's wealth was in Wiltshire where he held a vast number of estates, together with lands in Devon, Dorset and Somerset.⁷¹ Like the Stourtons, the Wests originated in thirteenth-century Wiltshire. Ennobled in 1402, by 1483, twenty-six year old Thomas, third Lord Lawarre, held at least ten manors here and numerous estates in Dorset, Devon, Somerset, Hampshire and Sussex.⁷² The son and heir of Sir John Dinham of Devon, Lord Dinham was the fifth knight in succession from a Devonshire family established there in Norman times. Dinham's kinsmen through marriage included leading Cornish knights, Sir Thomas Arundel of Lanherne and Sir Edmund Carew, and, in addition, John, Lord Zouche, with whom he was closely associated. His own matches with the widow of Lord Fitzwalter, and secondly the daughter of Sir Robert Willoughby, later Lord Brook,

69. J.G. Waller, 'The Lords of Cobham, their Monuments, and their Church', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, Vol. 11 (1877), pp. 103-4.

70. Cobham's mother was the daughter of Lord Audley, while his second wife was the daughter of Lord Bergavenny by his second wife, daughter of Sir Robert Howard: *C.P.*, Vol. I, p. 30; M. Cherry, *op.cit.*, pp. 7-9, 99-106. For Somerset lands where Cobham held at least nine manors, see Collinson, *passim*; *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, pp. 184, 215; *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4, *passim*; *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 184. For history and estates see in general 'Memorials of the Family of Cobham', *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, ed. J. Myers (1841), Vol. 7, pp. 320-54.

71. C. Botulph, J. Stourton, *History of the Noble House of Stourton* (London, 1899), Vol. 1, p. 251 and *passim*; *C.P.*, Vol. XII, Part I, p. 303. For Stourton's Somerset manors, see Collinson, *passim*; for Wiltshire lands, *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 5, p. 53; *ibid.*, Vol. 8, pp. 149, 159, 204.

72. *C.P.*, Vol. XII, Part 2, pp. 517-20; for West's Somerset manors, Collinson, *passim*; for Wiltshire lands, *V.C.H.* Wiltshire, Vol. 10, p. 23; *ibid.*, Vol. 13, pp. 21, 131, 159-60, 180, 212-3.

buttressed his holdings considerably.⁷³ The recipient in 1464 of forfeited Hungerford lands in Devon, his own estates here totalled twenty-one manors.⁷⁴

Yet the landed wealth of the leading gentry families rivalled that of the lesser nobility, with fortunes which belied their gentry status. For in an age where wealth preceded status, a number of knights and esquires were on an equal footing with some of the wealthiest barons in the realm. Before exploring this wealth, however, the discussion will focus on the gifts which resulted from their status, the patronage which further enabled the gentry to consolidate ; for as well as the supervision of their own lands, the leading gentry were selected for positions in estate-management as stewards, receivers, constables, keepers, parkers and porters of crown and duchy lands as well as the King's own inheritance and the forfeitures and escheats which came to the crown after 1461. Added to this, many of the nobles' estates (both resident and non-resident) were run by, and most probably in the interests of, the local gentry. Further, the wealth, influence and patronage deriving from, for example, the Berkshire lands of Lord Stanley (in right of his wife), or the Sussex lands of the earl of Northumberland, or again, the duke of Buckingham's extensive estates in the South, was exercised by the local knights and esquires as caretakers for these absentee landlords.

A number of the oldest and wealthiest families, some of whom had been ennobled, held hereditary positions in crown and duchy administration. The Hungerfords, for example, were constables of Windsor Castle, and for a time, of Devizes,⁷⁵ and were active as duchy of

73. The family's wealth was bolstered considerably in the early fourteenth century with the marriage of Sir John Dinham to Muriel Courtenay, daughter and coheir of Sir John Courtenay, and maternal granddaughter of Sir John Moeles. The Courtenay-Moeles inheritance ensured that the Dinhams became leading landowners in the county, see Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', pp. 106-114, especially pp. 108-9; see in general, *C.P.*, Vol. IV, p. 378 ; see also R. P. Chope, 'The Last of the Dynhams', *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, Vol. XLII (1911), pp. 435-7 and *passim*.

74. For Dinham's Devon lands including the Hungerford estates, see R. P. Chope, 'The Lord Dynham's Lands', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, New Series (1928), pp. 269-312. For Somerset lands, see Collinson, *passim*. As well as West Country estates, Dinham held a number of Buckinghamshire lands, including Cuddington, Little Kimble, Oving, Eythorpe and Cranwell: *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, pp. 268-9, 304; *ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 86, 111.

75. *C.P.R.*, 1422-9, p. 37. The Hungerfords were duchy of Lancaster officials from 1372, when Sir Thomas Hungerford (d. 1397) was appointed chief steward of John of Gaunt's manors in the South.

Lancaster officials.⁷⁶ These offices were lost after 1461, and by 1472 the Bourghiers John, Lord Berners, and his son Sir Thomas had become joint constables of Windsor;⁷⁷ although briefly replaced in 1483 by Sir John Elrington and Thomas Windsor, Sir Thomas Bourghier regained his position in 1485.⁷⁸ The Hungerfords' office at Devizes was lost to Sir Roger Tocotes and Robert Poyntz who, through Elizabeth Woodville's patronage, received the stewardship of the castle and bailiwick which they held jointly until 1473 when Tocotes held office alone.⁷⁹ Yet the Hungerfords reclaimed other positions, including the wardenship of the royal forest of Selwood in Wiltshire and the keepership of the forest of Mere held by Sir Walter some time after his father's death in 1464.⁸⁰ Others who benefited from crown lands in the region include William Brent, receiver at Southampton, Sir Thomas Melbourne and George Darrell, lieutenant and steward of Clarendon, respectively, and Edward Blount, deputy warden of Savernake Forest, while Thomas Beauchamp was appointed to keep the manor, town and lordship of Marlborough, together with Savernake.⁸¹ In 1469 Sir John Greville became rider and warden of the King's forest of Braydon and master of the game in Vastern park, replaced in the latter by Robert Willoughby.⁸² In adjoining Hampshire Bernard Brocas was master of the royal buckhounds, an office which the family held for over three hundred years.⁸³ Esquires John Cheyney and Robert Brewes were constables of Christchurch, Southampton and Winchester, the latter office held also by William Berkeley and John Roger.⁸⁴

The pattern was repeated in the central-southern counties, East Anglia and the South East where a number of established families were prominent in the maintenance of royal and duchy of Lancaster estates. In 1468 Sir Robert Harcourt received the stewardship of duchy manors including Dedington in Oxfordshire.⁸⁵ In 1477 Oxfordshire's Sir William Stonor became

76. V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 5, p. 76.

77. C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 243.

78. *Materials*, Vol. 1, p. 54; V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 24.

79. V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 10, p. 242; Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 631.

80. Selwood remained in the family as an hereditary office until c.1540: V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 4, pp. 348, 416; *ibid.*, Vol. 11, p. 139.

81. For Melbourne see V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 4, p. 442; Blount, *ibid.*, p. 439; for Beauchamp, *ibid.*, p. 261.

82. V.C.H., Wiltshire., Vol. 4, pp. 404, 435.

83. V.C.H., Hampshire, Vol. 3, p. 212; D.N.B., Vol. 2, p. 127.

84. C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 35; for Berkeley, 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V: Longleat Miscellaneous Manuscript', Book II, ed. R. Horrox, *Camden Miscellany*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXIX (1987), pp. 233-4; for Cheyney, *Wedgwood*, p. 182.

85. Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 631.

steward of the royal manors of Kirtlington, Hasely and Pyrton together with the manors of Wycombe, Bassetbury, Weston Turville and Crendon in Buckinghamshire.⁸⁶ His neighbour in Berkshire, Sir William Norris was steward of Cookham and Bray, keeper of 'Folly John' in Windsor Forest, had custody of Langley in 1479 and the keepership of Wychwood in Oxfordshire;⁸⁷ his associate, John Forster, became master forester of Enfield Chase and receiver-general of Elizabeth Woodville's lands.⁸⁸ John Harcourt, Sir Robert's son, received custody of an enticing piece of preferment called 'Burfordlaunde' accompanied by a lodge in Wychwood, together with Chadworth Wood, Gloucestershire. Along with his other office, Sir Thomas Bourghier was steward of Datchet in Berkshire ; Sir Richard Croft became receiver-general of the earldom of March, steward of Kirtlington and keeper of Woodstock in Oxfordshire, while his brothers, Thomas and Richard also received prominent positions.⁸⁹ In Norfolk Sir John Wingfield (with John Radcliffe, Lord Fitzwalter) was steward and receiver of the honour of Richmond, John Radcliffe had custody of the park at Richmond (in the gift of Elizabeth Woodville) while Wingfield's kinsman, Sir Henry Wingfield was governor of Orford Castle.⁹⁰ John Risley esquire received a life grant of the offices of bailiff and parker of Lavenham, Suffolk in 1467, and later, the keepership of Pleshey, Dunmow and other Essex lands, along with the stewardship of duchy of Lancaster estates both here and in Hertfordshire. As well as offices in Berkshire, Bourghier was constable of Leeds in Kent and keeper of Pirbright, Surrey.⁹¹ Also in Surrey, Sir Thomas St Leger became keeper of both Guildford and Henley parks (the latter a valuable piece of preferment accompanied by a residence), while Nicholas Gaynesford esquire became porter and then constable of Odiham.⁹²

86. *Ibid.*

87. *Wedgwood*, p. 640.

88. Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 612; Wolfe, *The Royal Demesne in English History*, p. 153.

89. For John Harcourt, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 103; for Bourghier, *Wedgwood*, p. 95; see also *Extant Documents*, p. 315; for Sir Richard Croft, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 105. Richard junior and Thomas Croft had the joint stewardship of Woodstock; Thomas was ranger of the royal forests of Shotover and Stowood in Oxfordshire and Bernewood in Buckinghamshire; together they were parkers of Woodstock, while Richard was ranger of Wychwood; see *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 75; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 17, 159; see also *Wedgwood*, p. 238.

90. *Some Records of the Wingfield Family*, ed. J.M. Wingfield (London, 1925), p. 25 for Sir Henry Wingfield, see also *Materials*, p. 202.

91. For Risley, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 534; R. Virgoe, 'Sir John Risley 1443-1512: Courtier and Councillor', *Norfolk Archaeology*, Vol. XXXVIII (1982), p. 142; for Bourghier, *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 364 and *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 278.

92. *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, pp. 3, 335; *C.P.R.*, 1461-67, p. 220. Gaynesford became porter in 1461 and constable in 1476.

In Kent, Robert Morton was keeper of the King's park in Canterbury, Robert Brent was keeper of Sandwich, his kinsman John became a feodary there, while Sir John Fogge was keeper of Rochester and supervisor of the deer and hunting; in Sussex, Sir Thomas Lewkenor became constable of Bodiham and also keeper of the park.⁹³

In the West Country the Lanherne Arundels and the Courtenays of Boconnoc, Cornwall held hereditary positions in duchy of Cornwall administration.⁹⁴ Others patronised include John Trevelyan, steward of the duchy's Devon lands, Richard Edgecombe a duchy escheator in Cornwall and John Nanfan keeper of Helston. Sir Giles Daubenay was keeper of Pether-ton Forest, and early in 1483 became constable of Bridgwater, held by the duchess of York.⁹⁵ Esquires Thomas Audley, John Halwell and John Wells became constable of Corfe castle, keeper of Stockenham Park and porter and constable of Exeter respectively, while Robert Morton of St Brenellys, Dorset, was receiver there of the King's forest of Deau.⁹⁶

Many servants benefited from the forfeitures and escheats which came to the crown after 1461. Gaynesford was given Lord Clifford's forfeited Surrey lands in 1462, while Sir John Fogge, with others, received the keepership of the earl of Oxford's estates, and in 1471, a number of forfeited lands and temporalities in the see of Norwich.⁹⁷ In 1478 Sir George Brown received the stewardship of Witley, Kent, forfeited by Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, Robert Wingfield became steward and receiver of Richmond lands in Norfolk and Suffolk, while Sir John St Lo received a number of the earl of Wiltshire's forfeited West Country estates.⁹⁸ A

93. P.R.O., C67/51/10; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 101; for Brent, Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 619; for Lewkenor, *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 7, pp. 257-8; *ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 263; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 370, 444, 535; for Fogge, *Wedgwood*, p. 340.

94. The Courtenays had been foresters of the chase of Dartmoor, stewards of the borough and manor of Bradninch and of all duchy lands in Devon together with the office of warden of the stannery there: Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 114; for Arundel, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 23.

95. For Trevelyan see *Trevelyan Papers Prior to A.D. 1558*, ed. J. P. Collier (London, 1856-7); for Edgecombe, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 95; for Nanfan, *D.N.B.*, Vol. XIV, p. 319; for Daubenay, *ibid.*, p. 47 and *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 337.

96. For Wells, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 3, 368. This man, a yeoman of the crown may not be the John Welles of Maxey, Northamptonshire, half-brother of Margaret Beaufort; for the others, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 68; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 213; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 280, 368; *ibid.*, p. 280; for Morton, P.R.O., C67/51/12.

97. For Gaynesford, *Wedgwood*, p. 368; for Fogge, *Wedgwood*, pp. 339-40.

98. *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 92, 128; *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 64; for Wingfield, Wolffe, *The Royal Demense in English History*, Appendix D, p. 295.

number of gentry gained through the duke of Clarence's downfall in 1478 including Brown who received the stewardships of Milton and Marden, Norris, the stewardships of Boreford, Shipton and Spellsbury and Sir Thomas Bourghier who became keeper of Clarence's lands in Kent.⁹⁹ Richard Cruse held extensive offices in the duke's forfeited Devon lands and John Halwell obtained the keepership of Stockenham and the constableness of Plympton. John Harcourt became receiver of Clarence's forfeited Warwick and Spenser lands in the west-midlands, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire; Sir Thomas St Leger received the stewardship of the late duke's duchy of Cornwall lands in Somerset, Devon and Cornwall, while St Lo was confirmed in the lordships of Baneston and 'Shokirwik', formerly the duke's domain.¹⁰⁰

In addition, the appointments by the crown of officials during the minority of nobles, either as stewards and receivers or custodians, also meant for the recipient power and influence within his region. John Harcourt's uncle, Sir Richard, was steward during the minority, of the Oxfordshire lands of Lord Saye and the earl of Shrewsbury; Sir Richard Croft's younger brother, Richard was receiver in Herefordshire of the latter's lands. Sir William Norris obtained custody of the Marchioness Montagu's lands during the minority of her son, while in 1479 Sir Giles Daubenay obtained the custody and marriage of John Bourghier, son of Lord Fitzwarin. Several years later, William Berkeley was appointed steward of Solihill, Warwickshire, during the minority of Clarence's son, Edward earl of Warwick.¹⁰¹

As well as these gifts, there was meed for service in the form of direct grants to valued servants. Collingbourne Ducis and Everleigh, part of Wiltshire's duchy of Lancaster estates were granted to William Collingbourne, who already held the keepership of Everleigh, while custody of the chase of Collingbourne was granted with the manor of Crawlboys to Thomas Wayte.¹⁰² Still in Wiltshire the duchy manor of Haxton was held by the Darell family; in

⁹⁹. C.P.R., 1476-85., pp. 92, 94 for Brown and Bourghier; C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 876; for Norris, C.P.R., 1475-85, p. 157.

¹⁰⁰. For Cruse, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 201, 255; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 213; for Halwell, *ibid.*, p. 213 and *Memorials*, no. 403; for Harcourt, 'Financial Memoranda of the reign of Edward V', ed. R. Horrox, p. 222; Wolffe, *The Royal Demense in English History*, Appendix D, p. 295; for St Leger, C.P.R., 1476-85., p. 91; for St Lo, *ibid.*, p. 87.

¹⁰¹. For Sir Richard Harcourt, C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 400; C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 44, 373; for Richard Croft, Wolffe, 'The Management of English Royal Estates under Yorkist Kings', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CCLXXVIII (1956), p. 6; for Norris, *Wedgwood*, p. 640; for Daubenay, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 177; for Berkeley, C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 859 (1482).

¹⁰². *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 11, pp. 109, 139.

Buckinghamshire Sir John Donne received Park manor, while in Sussex Sir Thomas Brown was granted the manor of Compton, originally a gift to his step-father, Thomas Vaughan, king's esquire, in 1461.¹⁰³ In 1480, Norfolk's Thomas Fiennes obtained the manor and lordship of Polsted Hall, and in Shropshire, Sir Richard Croft received the manor of Burford.¹⁰⁴ Patronage from duchy lands also took the form of profitable leases such as Fogge's grant in 1471 (renewed in 1480) of the gold and silver mines in Devon and Cornwall, or the gift of ten marks yearly to Thomas Treffry from the issues of the duchy. Others such as Sir Roger Tocotes received rewards such as a portion of the crown's rent from customs.¹⁰⁵

As the discussion has demonstrated, a number of the leading gentry such as Brent and Harcourt, Hungerford and Bourghier were employed in several areas, reflecting their wealth, range of interests, their standing with the crown, and above all, their power within the regions. In addition to the above-mentioned, Richard Haute from Kent became steward of Gower and constable of Swansea in 1481; John Cheyney was keeper of New Forest and steward of Cranbourne, Canford and Poole; Sir Thomas St Leger was keeper of Oldbury in Gloucestershire from 1463, Richard Beauchamp, constable of Gloucester, while from the early 1470s Fogge was active in the administration of the Prince of Wales's duchy of Cornwall lands, and, as noted, was repaid handsomely.¹⁰⁶

Apart from the rewards obtained through royal service which enabled the gentry to consolidate their power, crown patronage strengthened ties between the gentry and the nobility. In Wiltshire, for example, officers at Clarendon such as Sir Thomas Melbourne rubbed shoulders with the likes of William Fitzalan, earl of Arundel as warden of Clarendon Forest, with John Lord Audley, keeper of Wardour Castle and steward in Dorset and with John, Lord

103. For Darell, *ibid.*, p. 145; for Sir John Donne, *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 2, p. 264; for Brown, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 204.

104. *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 180; for Croft, Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 256.

105. For Treffry, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 43; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 83; for Tocotes, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 416. Tocotes received £74 a year from the customs in Bristol.

106. For Haute, *Wedgwood*, p. 436; Ross, *Richard III*, p. 36, n. 49; for Cheyney, *Wedgwood*, p. 182; St Leger, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 208; Beauchamp, *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 4, p. 21; Fogge, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 283; see also K. Houghton, 'Theory and Practice in Borough Elections to Parliament during the Later Fifteenth Century', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIX (1966), p. 137; S. Bolton, 'Sir John Fogge of Ashford', *The Ricardian*, Vol. V, No. 69 (1980), p. 205.

Dinham in Somerset, as custodian of the royal forests of Exmoor and Neroche.¹⁰⁷ The gentry mixed with Lord Hastings and the earl of Essex as stewards of duchy lands in the South;¹⁰⁸ with John Bourghier, Lord Berners in Berkshire as constable of Windsor and also with Lord Lovell and the duke of Suffolk as keeper and constable of Wallingford, respectively;¹⁰⁹ with John Lord Wenlock as steward in Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire;¹¹⁰ in Sussex with Sir William Fiennes, Lord Say, his kinsman Lord Dacre and Anthony, Earl Rivers as constables of Pevensey Castle and master foresters; and, fleetingly, with Henry, duke of Buckingham as constable of royal lands in Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire.¹¹¹ In turn, these ties meant patronage for the gentry in the form of offices within the estates of both resident and non-resident nobles, which further augmented their position. For as well as the supervision of their own manors and crown lands, the constables and stewards of Lord Stanley's Berkshire, South West and south-eastern estates, the earl of Northumberland's Sussex and West Country manors or the duke of Buckingham's large southern holdings, derived the benefits from this patronage in terms of power and influence within their own regions as caretaker landlords.

Of the resident nobles in the South West the Courtenay earls of Devon had, for generations, dispensed patronage in this way to the local leading families and the lesser gentry.¹¹² So too, in East Anglia gentry such as John Wingfield and William Brandon had served John Mowbray, duke of Norfolk as steward of all his castles in England, Wales and the Marches. Wingfield and Brandon with Robert Brewes and Ralph Tykhill were also annuitants of John de Vere, earl of Oxford.¹¹³ The dukes of Suffolk had engaged the services not only of key East Anglian knights and esquires but also men such as Sir William Stonor (whose mother was the natural daughter of the first duke) and Sir William Norris.¹¹⁴ Further south, to the east and west, the

107. V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 4, p. 442; see also P.R.O., Prob 11/9 f. 178 v, where 'my lord the earl of Arundell' was an executor for Melbourne; for Audley, Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 628; V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 13, p. 222; V.C.H., Somerset, Vol. 2, p. 565.

108. Somerville, *op.cit.*, pp. 428, 637.

109. For Berners, V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 3, p.24;; for Lovell and Suffolk, V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 2, p. 139; V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 528.

110. Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 605.

111. *Ibid.*, pp. 615-6, 621; for Buckingham, B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 9.

112. Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', pp. 121-2, and *passim*.

113. For Wingfield, *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 3, C 3535; see P.R.O., Prob 11/7, f. 86 v for Oxford's annuitants, and also P.R.O., Prob 11/6, f. 40.

114. Wedgwood, pp. 640, 814-5; Stonor's father had married the natural daughter of William, duke of Suffolk.

Cheyneys, Daubenays, Tocotes, Hungerfords and more, had, through the years, accepted offices in estate-management from barons such as the Lords Cobham, Stourton, Lawarre and Dinham and from leading nobles such as the dukes of Exeter and the earls of Wiltshire.

Yet it was the receiverships, stewardships and constabships of the lands of the non-resident nobles which were most highly prized by the gentry for the influence they afforded. In the fourteenth century, the Hungerfords were stewards of the earl of Salisbury's Wiltshire estates;¹¹⁵ by the mid-fifteenth century, Alexander Hody and John Nanfan were stewards of the earl's West Country lands alongside the Treffrys and later in the century, Sir William Berkeley and Richard Edgecombe.¹¹⁶ In Somerset Sir Giles Daubenay served Henry Percy earl of Northumberland for which he received an annuity for life; John Biconell was chief steward of the castle of Totnes, held by William Lord Zouch; William Willoughby was steward and overseer of the Warwickshire manors of John, Lord Clinton, while William Hussy was caretaker of an estate in Sussex demised by him to the earl of Worcester, for the earl's use when in the South East. In addition, numerous families in the South including the Bourgchiers, Hungerfords and Willoughbys had served as stewards, keepers and auditors of the duke of York's vast estates.¹¹⁷

By far the largest non-resident landowner whose estates were controlled by prominent gentry, however, was the duke of Buckingham. It is, in fact, interesting to observe a 'community' of Stafford annuitants in the South, who, throughout the decades were recipients of Stafford patronage. Indeed with eight widespread receiverships the Staffords relied heavily on the skill and expertise of administrative advisers in estate-management, many of whom were linked through ties of kinship. In Gloucestershire (as noted) the Poyntzes and Berkeleys helped to administer Buckingham's manor of Thornbury. Thomas Berkeley had begun his career as a deputy to Nicholas Poyntz, receiver of the family's estates in Gloucester, Hampshire and Wiltshire. Replacing Poyntz in 1453, he was receiver until 1462. Nicholas's son John, in turn, replaced Berkeley as receiver of the dowager duchess Anne's South West estates while William Berkeley's uncle had married Robert Poyntz's mother, Alice, connecting the two families. Stewards in Hampshire and Wiltshire, Sir Thomas Uvedale and Sir John Stourton

115. V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 5, p. 53.

116. Wedgwood, pp. 69, 292, 621-2; Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 888. Edgecombe was steward of the earldoms of Salisbury and Warwick, while Berkeley was steward of the Salisbury lands on the Isle of Wight.

117. For Daubenay, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 548; for Biconell, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 536; for Willoughby, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 331; for Hussy, *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 4, p. 15. For York's servants, P. A. Johnson, *Duke Richard of York 1411-1460*, Clarendon Press (Oxford, 1988), Appendix III.

respectively, were later replaced by, among others, Sir William Berkeley, Sir William Nottingham and John Twynyho, the latter, steward of the duke's Gloucester and Wiltshire estates in the 1470s and later chief steward of Buckingham's manor of Thornbury.¹¹⁸

In the South East (again, as noted) a number of Kentish gentry - St Legers, Scotts, Cheyneys of Sheppey, Pympe and Guildfords were associated with the duke through his overlordship of Nettlestead, the Pympe's main seat. John Pympe, a ward of the first duke and later of duchess Anne, from whom he held East Barmyng and other lands in Kent, doubtless helped to administer this estate and others in Kent of which Buckingham was overlord. Pympe had married Elizabeth Cheyney, kinswoman of Thomas, and sister of John Cheyney. Through his mother Philippa St Leger, who later married John Gaynesford, he was connected with prominent South West knight, Thomas St Leger, while Gaynesford's son Richard, had married his sister Anne. Richard Gaynesford's grandfather, John, had been steward of Stafford lands in Surrey from 1428 to 1448. In the early 1450s, John Forster's kinsmen, John and William, were employed by the first duke in the administration of Writtle in Essex, and also Maxstoke, Warwickshire; so too were Thomas Bray, John Hall, John Wells, William Daniell, John Hay, Edward Delamare, Nicholas Poyntz and Thomas Berkeley, while John Harcourt's uncle, Sir William was steward of Maxstoke from 1460-66. In the West Country, John Trevelyan's father was employed by the first duke, as was Sir Thomas Arundel's father, John, steward of Buckingham's duchy manor of Caliland from 1451 to 1456, while the Twynyhos, closely connected with the Berkeleys and Poyntzes, also served the Staffords through the generations.¹¹⁹

Others, some of whom specialised in estate-management were associated with many of the above through their service to the Staffords. They included John Clerk, Thomas Stidolf, Richard Bruyn (the latter with Stidolf, receivers of Buckingham's Kent and Surrey estates) and generations of the Harper family, who served the dukes of Buckingham as receivers-

118. G. Waters, 'The Gloucester Scene - August 1483', *Richard III, Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 241-3; for Stourton, Berkeley, Nottingham and Uvedale, Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, Appendix B, p. 210. For Twynyho see also *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 4, A 9652.

119. For Gaynesford, Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 608; Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, Appendix B, p. 212; for Trevelyan, *ibid.*, p. 74 and Appendix D, p. 235; for Arundel, *ibid.*, Appendix B, p. 203; for John Twynyho, *ibid.*, Appendix B, p. 210 and Appendix C, p. 227; for Sir William Harcourt, *ibid.*, Appendix B, p. 205; for others, 'The Account of the Great Household of Humphrey, First Duke of Buckingham, for the year 1452-3', ed. M. H. Harris, *Camden Miscellany*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXIX (London, 1984), pp. 11-53.

general, stewards and auditors. Also included was John Harcourt (above-mentioned) who was receiver of a number of the duchess of Buckingham's lands from 1465.¹²⁰

Crown patronage fostered ties between the gentry and the nobility; importantly, it also strengthened ties between the gentry and the King. Both Nicholas Gaynesford esquire and Sir John Fogge were young hunting companions of Edward IV in the mid-1460s and received Christmas presents of wine, in appreciation of their service and also to have on hand for the next royal visit 'that we in our hunting for the hare may have it for our drinking'.¹²¹ That Edward was both accessible to his servants and a confidant of some is evident in a deposition of 1496 made by Sir John Risley who recalled hunting with the King in Waltham Forest and 'being able to consult him about business there'.¹²²

Thus far, the discussion has demonstrated that the crown - members of the royal family - and leading courtiers maintained a strong presence in the South, and that a number of the most powerful non-resident nobles had substantial holdings there. Through their mediation of royal and aristocratic influences, the leading gentry represented an oligarchy in the South who exercised substantial power within the regions. Significantly, at a time when the indigenous nobility had been weakened through extinction and forfeiture, by 1483, the political independence of the wealthiest knights and esquires was considerable.

In terms of their associations, it is little surprising that these men mixed with the higher aristocracy and had access to the King. For 'the man who got wealth would get status, especially if he invested in its supreme demonstration, land'.¹²³ And the gentry did just that. By the second half of the fifteenth century, the majority of the leading gentry from old and established families had built up extensive units of estates. Selective marriages - some, with daughters of the nobility - purchase and patronage had enabled these men to consolidate within the various regions where they attracted royal and noble attention and, as has been demonstrated, were repeatedly chosen for service within crown and noble lands. This attention, in turn, further augmented their position within their own region, and, at times, further afield. Undoubtedly, the basis of their wealth, power and status was the land. It is on this topic that the discussion will now focus.

¹²⁰. Harper, P.R.O., C67/51/8 and Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, pp. 81-2, Appendix B, pp. 201, 205, 215, 216; for Stidolf and Bruyn, *ibid.*, p. 212.

¹²¹. Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 106-7.

¹²². Virgoe, 'Sir John Risley 1443-1512: Courtier and Councillor', p. 142.

¹²³. E.W. Ives, *The Common Lawyers of Pre-Reformation England* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 374.

It is proposed to examine the landed wealth of fifteen knights and esquires: Sir Roger Tocotes, Walter Hungerford esquire, Sir William Stonor, Sir William Norris, Sir Thomas Lewkenor, Sir John Fogge, Nicholas Gaynesford, Richard Guildford, Sir Giles Daubenay, Sir William Berkeley, Robert Poyntz, Sir Thomas Arundel, Edward Courtenay esquire, Sir Henry Bodrugan and John Trevelyan. Needless to say, there were many other men of considerable wealth.¹²⁴ However a survey of the relevant county histories (which best allow an insight into gentry lands) and numerous other sources indicate that the sample were among the cream of the landed gentry. It is proposed to give brief histories of these families, lands accrued, and where possible an indication of their value.

Of the Wiltshire based gentry Walter Hungerford esquire and Sir Roger Tocotes were the wealthiest landowners. Originally from Tocketts in Guisborough, Yorkshire, Tocotes achieved much of his wealth through a profitable match with Elizabeth Braybrooke, daughter and heiress of Gerald Braybrooke and widow of Sir William Beauchamp, Lord St Amand (d.1457) from whom he obtained lands in the South West and elsewhere. He also possessed large estates in Cheshire, the March of Wales, Bedfordshire and Berkshire. Overall, Tocotes held at least nineteen manors, including six lordships, and numerous lands and tenements.¹²⁵ His main seat, Bromham, Wiltshire was valued at £100 in 1484, while his Cheshire lands together with a number of southern lordships were assessed at a yearly value of 1,000 marks.¹²⁶ Undoubtedly, Hungerford's wealth (or potential wealth) surpassed that of Tocotes. Walter was the second son of Robert Lord Hungerford (attainted 1461), and from the 1350s the family had been leading landowners in Wiltshire, holding in 1461 a minimum of twenty-eight lordships, plus twelve in

¹²⁴. This list is by no means exhaustive. However a study of the available records suggests that these men were among the wealthiest landed gentry in the South.

¹²⁵. Tocotes held lands and tenements in at least thirty-one parishes in Wiltshire: Middleton, Cowlestone, Eilestock, Wortone, Poterne, Wyke, Nustede, Southbrome, Stret, Cotes, Rindeway, Cannings, Estone, Ore, Aubury, Roucley, Ricardestone, Stokley, Whetham, Bromham, Sanderghil, Toderington, Kaleways, Chippenham, Stanley, Buddestone, Uphaven, Altone, Milstone, Duringtone, and Sherebetone, see *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 236; for other Wiltshire estates as well as lands in Berkshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Gloucestershire, Devon, Somerset, Cheshire and the Welsh Marches, *ibid.*, pp. 196, 266, *ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 32, 37, 82, 90-1, 110. See also *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 8, p. 50; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 10, p. 165; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 11, pp. 170, 174; *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 11, p. 168.

¹²⁶. For Bromham, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 37; for value of other lands, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 476, 501.

Somerset, several in Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Surrey. Hungerford regained a number of his forfeited lands in the 1460s, and full restoration with the reversal of his attainder in 1485.¹²⁷

The Oxfordshire Stonors and the Norrises of Bray, Berkshire were among the leading landowners in their region. The Stonors, established at Stonor by the thirteenth century, consolidated early in the next century largely through the acquisitions of John de Stonor (d.1354), chief justice of the common pleas. Their extensive manors in the fifteenth century prompted the wife of Thomas Stonor II to 'beseech' him to '...contend your little abiding at home...'¹²⁸ With centres of power in Oxford, Kent, Berkshire, Somerset, Devon, Cornwall, Gloucester, Hampshire and Northumberland, Thomas's son, Sir William collected numerous estates through his matches with Agnes Wydeslade and Anne Neville, daughter of John, Marquis of Montagu. An Inquisition taken after his death established his landed wealth at £400. However a number of estates are not listed and it is clear that his total wealth far exceeded this figure.¹²⁹ Established in Berkshire for a number of generations, by 1483 Sir William Norris possessed vast territory, including at least nineteen manors and considerable

127. For the family's Wiltshire lands acquired before the death of Walter, first Lord Hungerford: *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 5, p. 53, including estates at Wellow (now Hampshire), Teffont Evias, Heytesbury (a principal seat), Ashley, Mildenhall, Rushall, Codford, Great Cheverell, Biddestone, Tytherington, Sutton Veny, Imber, Warminster, Upton Scudmore, Leigh, Fonhill, Hornington, Maiden Bradley; see also *ibid.*, p. 76; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 8, pp. 39, 63, 67, 81, 99; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 9, p. 55; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 10, pp. 55, 91; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 13, pp. 159, 213; for Somerset lands, Collinson, *passim*; for Berkshire estates, *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4, p. 183; for Surrey land, *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 4, p. 43.

128. For quotation, *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 106.

129. For Stonor's estates in Berkshire, Devon, Gloucester, Hampshire, Kent, Oxfordshire and Somerset, *C.I.P.M.*, nos. 1031, 977, 973, 961, 1175, 1030 and 1129, respectively; for Berkshire lands, *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 3, *passim*; *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 6, pp. 66, 200; *V.C.H.*, Buckinghamshire, Vol. 3, p. 41; *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 3, p. 435; *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 4, p. 383; for some of Stonor's West Country, Kent, Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire estates, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 188, 250, and *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 32, 137; for the Devon manors of Ermington, the hundred and manor of Hode and 'Clisle Bernefeld' and the manor of Wolveston, Cornwall, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 433, 481; for Stonor's manor of Marlborough, from which together with the lordship, John Kendale received a grant of £80 in 1484: *ibid.*, p. 454; for Horton, Kent, the yearly value of which was £20, *ibid.*, p. 529. Sir William Stonor's marriage with Agnes Wydeslade brought him vast estates in Devon and Cornwall, while through his third match with Anne Neville he augmented his fortune in Northumberland; see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxiii and *C.I.P.M.*, no. 161.

lands and tenements in Berkshire, estates in Devon, Somerset, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Middlesex, Norfolk, Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire. Norris married Jane de Vere, daughter and heiress of the earl of Oxford (d. 1462), and secondly, Isabel, daughter and heiress of Sir Edmund Ingleshorpe and widow of the Marquis of Montagu, which, like Stonor, brought him valuable connections with the nobility. With great wealth, the Middlesex lands alone which he obtained through Isabel, amounted to 500 marks.¹³⁰

The Lewkenors of Trotton, Sussex, were a prominent family established in the county from the reign of Edward I. Marriages through the centuries allied them to the Wests, lords Delawarre and the Nevilles and brought vast wealth. Sir Thomas, whose grandfather had married the heiress of Bodiam Castle, Philippa Dalyngruge, and whose father married the heiress of Lord Camoys, continued this trend through his own match with Eleanor Audley. At his death in 1484, Sir Thomas held twenty-nine manors in Sussex, estates in Surrey, Middlesex, Hertfordshire and Northampton.¹³¹ In Surrey, the Gaynesfords were pre-eminent landowners.

130. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 198, 250 and *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 32 for Gloucestershire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Norfolk manors; *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 3, *passim* for the following manors - Ockwells, Ockholt, Hyndens, Mores, Elington, Spencers, Sunninghill, Newenham, Purley Parra, Adresham, Fulscot, Aldworth, Stokes Compton, Ashden, Frilsham, Hamstead, Benham Lovell, Yattendon (main seat) and Whatcombe: *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 3, p. 195. *C.I.P.M.*, nos. 210, 212-213, 215, 217, 222, 239; see also *C.I.P.M.*, no. 212 for Middlesex annuity of 500 marks. For other of Norris's estates in the South West and Hertfordshire, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 63; for Norfolk manors of Kenwick and Ingoldsthorpe, and still others, *ibid.*, pp. 54-56, 487 which he obtained through his wife Isabel Neville; see also *ibid.*, p. 471 for Norris's Leicestershire manor of Branston; see *C.C.R.* 1476-85, no. 175 for additional estates in Gloucestershire, Hampshire and Norfolk. Originally from Normandy, Sir William's forbears, the Norrises of Speke settled in Lancashire towards the end of the twelfth century. Branches of the family married into leading Cheshire and Lancashire families. Sir William himself was the son of the distinguished courtier John Norris, originally from Liverpool, and an associate of Thomas Lord Stanley. See G. Ormerod, 'A Memoir on the Lancashire House of Le Noreis or Norres', *Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire Transactions*, No. 2 (1850), p. 159 and *passim*.

131. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 101 and *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 33, 108-9, 181 for Herefordshire, Northamptonshire and Middlesex lands; for Sussex manors, *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 4, pp. 6, 9, 15, 35-36, 56, 66; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, Part 1, p. 152; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, Part 2, p. 161; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 7, pp. 81, 95, 194, 257; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 9, pp. 153, 158, 242, 263; *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 4, p. 308; *V.C.H.*, Middlesex, Vol. 4, pp. 228, 282, 284. See also W.D. Cooper, 'Pedigree of the Lewkenor Family', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, No. 3 (1850), pp. 89-102. Sir Roger's first match with

Nicholas Gaynesford esquire of Crowhurst and Carshalton, was the third son of John (d. 1450), and uncle of the distinguished John Gaynesford of Allington, Kent (d. 1491). Well-established in Surrey by the fifteenth century, Gaynesford married wealthy heiress Margaret Sydney of Sussex from whom he obtained considerable lands there and elsewhere, which, together with his family's estates in Surrey, Sussex, Kent and Berkshire, secured his place among the wealthiest gentry.¹³² In neighbouring Kent, the Fogges were originally a Lancashire family who moved to Kent in the reign of Edward I. Again, profitable alliances with wealthy heiresses gained for them sizeable estates in Kent, including Repton in Ashford, their main seat. Through Sir John Fogge's own marriages to Alice Kiriell and Alice Haute, whose mother was the Queen's aunt, Fogge added to the family's fortunes and became a leading landowner in the region with as many as twenty estates in Kent alone.¹³³

Richard Guildford esquire (d. 1506) of Cranbrook and Rolvenden, Kent, was an intimate of Fogge and Gaynesford, and like both men, an established and wealthy landowner in the region.¹³⁴ The grandson of Edward Guildford (d. 1449), Richard was the son and heir of Sir John

Eleanor Audley was followed by his marriage to Catherine, daughter of Sir John Pelham and widow of John Bramshot: *ibid.*, p. 35.

132. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 83 and 126; for other of Gaynesford's estates, *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 563; *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 4, pp. 184, 275-8; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, Part 1, p. 178; *V.C.H.*, Berkshire, Vol. 4; The Gaynesfords held a minimum of twelve estates in Surrey and probably considerably more as the manor count here is incomplete: Poyle, East Sheen, a moiety in Carshalton, East Shalford, Crowhurst (the Gaynesford's main seat, acquired in 1338 and held for nearly four centuries), Crowhurst Place, Chellows, Horne, Bysshe Court, a moiety in Harrowsley, Blackfield and Netherburch.

133. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 116, 207; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 77 for Kent manors, Old Oven, Crixall, Harpenden, Repton Ashford, Cheriton, Mykill Repton and Little Repton. Marriages with wealthy heiresses acquired for Sir John Fogge's forbears, Sir Francis, and his great-grandson, Sir William a number of the above including Cheriton and Repton, and also the manors of Beechborough, Sene Farm and Milton in east-Kent. Through Sir John's first alliance he obtained Great Mongeham, Sutton Farm, Walmer, Honichild, Blackmanstone, Westenhanger and Ham. His second match with Alice Haute brought him Ashenfield. Fogge also possessed Dane Court, Tonford, Owens Court, Tappington and Heppington in Kent as well as the manor and town of Dounton Weylate in Essex and the manor of Preston and Hoo, Sussex: Bolton, *op.cit.*, pp. 202-3; J. R. Dunlop, 'Pedigree of the Family of Crioll, or Kyriell, of co. Kent', *Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica*, Fifth Series No. 6 (1926-7), p. 259.

134. Originally from Hempsted in Benendon, Kent, the Guildfords had prospered in the county for nine generations; Richard Guildford's great-grandfather was sheriff of Kent in 1387, and his

(d. 1493) by his first wife. His father married secondly, Philippa, the widow of John Pympe while Richard himself married firstly Anne Pympe, Philippa's daughter, and secondly Jane, sister of Sir Nicholas, Lord Vaux of Harrowden.¹³⁵ Like many solid gentry families, judicious alliances netted numerous estates for the Guildfords, mainly in Kent, such as Tenterden acquired through Edward's marriage with Julia Picklesdon. Purchase and patronage extended their holdings in adjoining counties, most particularly through Richard's good fortune in the 1470s and early 1480s.¹³⁶

In the West Country, few of the gentry rivalled the wealth of knights William Berkeley, Giles Daubenay, Thomas Arundel and Henry Bodrugan and esquires Robert Poyntz, Edward Courtenay and John Trevelyan. Gloucestershire-based Sir William Berkeley and Robert Poyntz were kinsmen, (as noted) Berkeley's uncle, Sir Edward, having married Poyntz's mother.¹³⁷ The son of Sir Maurice Berkeley of Beverstone, and Anne West, (kinswoman of the Lords Delawarre) Sir William married Katherine, daughter of the third Lord Stourton. This marriage increased Berkeley's stake in the West, particularly in Wiltshire and Somerset where he held at least twenty-three manors. His own Gloucestershire lands were augmented in 1481 with the

grandfather in 1431; see *D.N.B.*, Vol. VIII, p. 770; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 9, p. 151 and *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 68.

135. *Wedgwood*, pp. 403-4. The Pympe connection brought the Guildfords valuable connections with other knightly families as well as the higher aristocracy. The Pympes were cousins of Sir Thomas St Leger and kinsmen of the wealthy Cheyneys and Scotts. Further, through Reginald Pympe's marriage with Elizabeth Passale, (whose family had intermarried with the Nevilles and the Howards) a kinswoman of the Woodvilles, they had important contacts with the court of Edward IV. In addition, the Pympes had long-standing connections with the earls and dukes of Buckingham (as noted) making them very valuable relatives indeed; see Ball, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-177. John Pympe's bequests in 1496 include 'Master Sir Thomas St Leger and my lady his wife...Sir John Cheyney...' and 'Sir Richard Guildford and my sister his wife...'; see P.R.O., Prob., 11/11, fos. 21v-r.

136. For Kent manors, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 55-6, 77. Rolvendon was assessed at a yearly value of 200 marks in 1484. Richard Guildford possessed Findon in Sussex, originally part of the Mowbray estates; he bought Marsham and Foder, possessed 1800 acres and six tenements in East Guildford and was granted the bailiwick and town of Winchester, together with the manors of Higham and Camber Castle; numerous manors in Kent included Rolvenden, Tentirden, Cranbrook and Halden: *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 6, Part 1, p. 24; *V.C.H.*, Sussex, Vol. 9, pp. 68-9, 71, 151, 177, 185; see also P.R.O., Prob 11/9, f. 223 v.

137. *Waters, op.cit.*, pp. 242-3; see also, J. Maclean, 'Manor of Tockington, co, Gloucester', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, Vol. 12 (1887), p.151.

acquisition of many of his grandfather's estates.¹³⁸ Robert Poyntz, descended from the barons Poyntz of Cory Mallet, Somersetshire, came from a leading family established in the West Country since the Conquest or soon after, and from 1344, based at Iron Acton, Gloucestershire. Poyntz's great-great grandfather, Sir John Poyntz, was the first of an unbroken line of knights and esquires, lords of Iron Acton until 1680. Prudent marriages through the centuries saw them allied to the Lords Zouch of Harringworth, the Gloucestershire Fitz Nichols and the Husseys of Sussex. Sir Robert's own match was with the natural daughter of Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers. By 1483, the wealth and power of Poyntz was centered in Gloucestershire, Dorset and Somerset.¹³⁹

Further west in Somerset, Sir Giles Daubenay, like Poyntz, came from an almost unbroken succession of knights through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Well-established at their main seat, South Petherton by 1243, Sir Giles's father, William (d. 1461) had married Alice, daughter of John, Lord Stourton. At her death in 1473, Giles inherited numerous lands as her son and heir and as the grandson of Lord Stourton. Sir Giles's own match was with Elizabeth, daughter of Sir John Arundel of Lanherne. With estates in Cornwall, Dorset, Devon and further

¹³⁸. For some of Berkeley's Gloucestershire, Somerset, Dorset, Wiltshire and Hampshire lands, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 174, 176, 193, 269; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 31-2, 58; see also Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 123, 282, 309, 327, 403; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, pp. 49, 144, 165, 170, 246, 275, 445, 483, and *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, p. 233; for Hampshire estates, *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 2, pp. 486, 502, 504, 516; *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 3, p. 291; *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 4, pp. 28, 537, 580, 621, 636; *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 5, p. 114; for Gloucestershire lands, *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 7, p. 229; for Wiltshire estates, *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 6, p. 42; for Sir William's acquisition of his grandfather's lands, Waters, *op.cit.*, and Wedgwood, p. 69; see also *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, no. 895, for Sir Maurice Berkeley's Thornbury lands obtained by Sir William. Berkeley's main seat, Beverstone, Gloucestershire, was estimated at £60 per annum in 1484; three Somerset manors were valued at £41. Either Berkeley or a close kinsman held the manor of Tockington purchased by Thomas, Lord Berkeley in 1355 from Sir Nicholas Poyntz, which was settled, with Beverstone, on his youngest son John, 'the progenitor of the family of Berkeley of Beverston'. Comprised of six knights fees, it was estimated at £200 per annum in 1398, and sold for £2,700 in 1609; see Maclean *op.cit.*, pp. 136-137.

¹³⁹. Despite the fact that mismanagement caused the Poyntzes of Cory Mallet, Somerset, to alienate Tockington to Lord Berkeley in 1355, an offshoot of this branch settled at Iron Acton and flourished; see *V.C.H.*, Vol. 7, p. 212; Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 33; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 300; in general see *D.N.B.*, Vol. XVI, p. 277, Maclean, *op.cit.*, and H. L. Thompson, 'The Poyntz Family', *Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society Transactions* (1879-80), pp. 73-85.

afield in Lincolnshire, Daubenay's main acquisitions were in Somerset.¹⁴⁰ Yet his brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Arundel was from one of the wealthiest gentry families in the country. Solid wealth in seven counties amounted to over £2000 after his father's death in 1476. Established in Cornwall from the mid-twelfth century, the union of Renfrid Arundel with Alice Pincerna in the early fourteenth century saw a vast accretion of landed power in Cornwall and elsewhere.¹⁴¹ Renfrid's ancestor, Robert Arundel held twenty-eight lordships in the post-conquest period, and matches with knightly and noble families augmented the family's wealth. Arundel's father, Sir John, had married Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas, Lord Morley, and secondly Catherine, widow of William Stafford esquire and daughter and coheir of Sir John Chidiok. Through this union the Arundels, like the Berkeleys and the Daubenays, were linked with Lord Stourton. Sir Thomas's own match was with Catherine, daughter of Sir John Dinham, sister and coheir of John, Lord Dinham.¹⁴²

140. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 277; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 32; for Cornish manors of Fowyton and Lanteglos, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 478; for Somerset lands, *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, pp. 114, 169; *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 4, pp. 129, 176, 179, 182 and Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 55; *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 434; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, pp. 81, 113-4; for Lincolnshire manors of Ingleby, Saxilby and Broxhome, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 424, see also *D.N.B.*, Vol. V, p. 540; for Dorset and Wiltshire estates Collinson, *op.cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 109; for Daubenay history, *ibid.*, pp. 107-109.

141. Renfrid's grandson married Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of Sir John Lanherne of Lanherne, Cornwall, while another descendant married Joan, daughter and heiress of John de la Beer of Tolverne. Their son married Elizabeth, daughter and coheir of Sir Oliver Carminow, while their grandson, Sir John was the direct ancestor to the Arundels of Lanherne, Wardour Castle, Trerice, Tolverne and several other branches, see R. Carew, *The Survey of Cornwall*, ed. F. E. Halliday (London, 1953), p. 220; Gilbert, *op.cit.*, p. 472. The sister of Sir John Arundel's second wife, Catherine Chidiok, married William, Lord Stourton. Sir Thomas's sisters also married well: Elizabeth to Sir Giles Daubenay and another to Sir Walter Courtenay.

142. Sir John Arundel (d. 1476) was one of the most powerful Cornish knights with at least eighteen manors there, as well as estates in Devon, Somerset, Dorset, Gloucestershire, Buckinghamshire and Wiltshire. Sir John's lands at his death included Kyngesey in Buckinghamshire, and the manor of Chidiok, Dorset, worth 40 marks; an estate in Gloucestershire worth 24 marks; three manors in Somerset worth £56, and in Wiltshire a sixth part of Westbury worth £10; see *C.I.P.M.*, nos. 30, 55, 181-184; see also Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 373-946. For overall estimate of Arundel lands, *D.N.B.*, Vol. 1, p. 613; for number of lordships in the post-conquest period, Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 471. For the Arundels' Somerset manors, see Collinson, *passim*, and *V.C.H.*, Somerset, Vol. 3, pp. 52, 205. The Arundels' connection with Lord Stourton transpired through the marriage of his second wife's sister with William, Lord Stourton, see Gilbert, *op.cit.*, pp. 664-5.

Rivalling the Arundels in Cornwall, a junior branch of the Courtenay earls of Devon, the Courtenays of Boconnoc moved to Cornwall in the second quarter of the century through Sir Hugh's match with the Carminowe heiress. The Courtenay earls of Devon had been established in the county since the mid-twelfth century, and had forged matches with the de Veres, Despencers, Bonvilles, St Johns, Talbots, Bohuns and Plantagenets, which enabled them to consolidate in the South West and elsewhere. Edward Courtenay held at least fifteen manors in Cornwall and numerous estates in neighbouring counties. However in 1485 his fortune swelled considerably with the restoration of the earldom in his name.¹⁴³

There were others such as the Bodrugans and Trevelyans who were almost a match for the Arundels and Courtenays. The Bodrugans had been a family of great consequence in Cornwall from the time of Edward I. By the later fifteenth century Sir Henry Bodrigan, although often in debt, held lands said to be worth over £1000 per annum. Like the above, Bodrigan was a wealthy local landowner whose estates included Treworick, Trecoyse, Pentrasa, Markwell, Tregrehan, Tremodret, Trelawny, Restranguet and Newham, the last two in Falmouth Haven.¹⁴⁴ His main seat, Bodrigan, was nestled in a park at Dodman Point, '...And in this park was the house of Sir Henry Bodrigan, a man of ancient stock attainted for taking part with King Richard III against Henry VII'.¹⁴⁵ Like most of the wealthiest gentry, the Trevelyans, established in Cornwall since the late eleventh century, built up estates through purchase and rich alliances. In the mid-fifteenth century, fortune smiled on the Trevelyans in the form of a marriage between John Trevelyan esquire and his cousin, Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of Thomas Whalesborough, and sister and sole heiress of her uncle, Sir Simon Raleigh of Nettlecombe, Somerset. Substantially augmenting his estates on his marriage in 1460, after

143. For Courtenay history, R. N. Worth, *A History of Devonshire*, ed. E. Stock (London, 1886), p. 56. The yearly value of Boconnoc, Gly and Broadoak was estimated at £66 in 1484: *C.P.R.*, 1475-85, p. 502. Edward Courtenay's manor of Gatcombe, Devon was valued at £21 per annum, and Huish Champflower, Somerset, at £6: *ibid.*, pp. 472, 527. Many of the Courtenay estates were extensive such as Treverbyn Courtenay comprised of a huge manor with a large area of commons: see Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 36. Other estates possessed by Edward Courtenay in Devon were Gotherington, 'Wigwille' and 'Cattepathe': *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 125, 128, 137. For Courtenay's Somerset estates see Collinson, *passim*.

144. For an estimate of Bodrigan's landed wealth at his death, and for the family's history, see Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 29; for Bodrigan's Cornish manors, *ibid.*, pp. 418, 799, 808, 847, 853, 914; see also *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, p. 64 and *ibid.*, Vol. 4, A 9452, p. 425; Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, pp. 102-5 and A. L. Rowse, 'The Turbulent Career of Sir Henry de Bodrigan', *History*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 109 (1944), pp. 23-4; *C.P.R.*, 1485-94, p. 224.

145. For quotation, Leland, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 201.

Raleigh's death in 1481, Trevelyan inherited all his kinsman's estates in Somerset. With extensive manors in Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, Surrey and Sussex, Trevelyan's wealth at his death was well in excess of £1000.¹⁴⁶

With the possible exception of Sir William Stonor whose main estates were in the South West and other regions, these men had enormous wealth within their principal counties.¹⁴⁷ While it is difficult to assess with any certainty the total value of any one man's lands, the wealth of these rich local landowners was well in excess of £1000 per annum, and in some cases, considerably higher. This wealth, and the status which ensued doubtless influenced the type of patronage exercised by the crown and the nobility. At a time when the resident nobility was 'thin on the ground', the southern gentry were able to consolidate further within the regions through their role in the administration of royal and noble estates, benefiting not just materially, but in terms of influence and power. They were, in fact, well-placed to dominate local society. On a footing with the minor barons (with whom many were connected through marriage ties and office-holding) their political power and degree of independence, created a framework which they utilised in their revolt against Richard III in 1483. It is proposed now to explore the social connections which the leading gentry enjoyed, and the sources of gentry solidarity, both within and throughout the regions, which also facilitated the framework for their rising. The following discussion will focus on the leaders and many others indicted in 'Buckingham's rebellion'.

¹⁴⁶ For Trevelyan history see Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 564, and Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 102. In the reign of Edward II the Bodrugans and Trevelyans were linked through the marriage of Felicia, widow of William de Bodrugan, to her second husband, Andrew de Trevelyan. The Trevelyans benefited from this alliance, and Felicia's grandson, Thomas made considerable acquisitions to his landed property in and around Lostwithiel (close to his main seat, Trevelyan) and elsewhere in the county. With numerous manors, lands and tenements in thirty-five Cornish parishes, John Trevelyan had bought and obtained through dowry estates in Devon, Somerset, Surrey and Sussex. While an inventory taken in the late fourteenth century calculated Trevelyan's wealth at £191, the family's fortunes were, in fact, well in excess of £1,000: 'Trevelyan papers' *op.cit.*, pp. 6-17, 91, 93.

¹⁴⁷ A number also had great landed wealth elsewhere, but most often a concentration in the county of their principal seat.

CHAPTER 4

THE REBELS

1. County Concerns, Regional Identity

In the second half of the fifteenth century southern England possessed a number of very wealthy gentry families who exercised a great degree of power, influence and control within the regions based on their own landed wealth and, a corollary, the benefits of running crown and noble (both resident and non-resident) estates. A number of the wealthiest and most powerful knights and esquires have been identified through the regional survey and patterns of landholding. Most of these men were key participants in the revolt of 1483. The aim of this section is to explore and analyse the functions, concerns and status of the gentry rebels (as representative of the leading families) within their various counties, within their regions, and at court. The following discussion will introduce a representative sample of rebels and will place them both within a county and a regional context. What manner of people were they? It is proposed to explore their interaction on the local scene: their interrelatedness, co-operation, rivalry and administrative work. This will be followed by the gentry's kinship connections and interaction with the nobility within and across the regions, with non-resident nobles, and with prominent courtiers. The focus will then be directed on the gentry as careerists: their employment both by the greater aristocracy, and at court.

Further to the survey of the power-structure of landed society, Chapter four seeks to illuminate the main sources of solidarity among the gentry across the South, which promoted social cohesion within their ranks. It also aims to accent the nature of their relations with the nobility at court and within the royal household, further emphasising their power, independence and the socio-political structures which enabled the gentry to mount their revolt in 1483.

Fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen have been selected for the following study; participants in 'Buckingham's rebellion' in the various centres of revolt, thirty-six of these were attainted, the remainder, indicted without formal attainder. From Exeter the attainted are Thomas Arundel, Thomas St Leger and Robert Willoughby knights, and Edward Courtenay, John Halwell, Richard Nanfan, John Trevelyan and John Treffry esquires; those escaping attainder: Sir Thomas Fulford and Sir John Crocker, and esquires, Thomas Audley, Thomas Brandon, John Cheverell, Richard Edgecombe, William Twynyho and kinsmen, Richard and Robert Morton. From the Salisbury sector the following were attainted - Giles Daubenay,

Nicholas Latimer and John St Lo knights; Walter Hungerford, John Cheyney and John Trenchard esquires; Humphrey and Alexander Cheyney and John Heron gentlemen. The proscribed at Newbury include Richard Beauchamp, William Berkeley, Thomas Delamare, William Norris, William Overey, William Stonor and Roger Tocotes knights, together with esquires William Uvedale and John Harcourt, and Edmund Hampden, gentleman. Involved with Buckingham at Brecon, Sir William Knyvet avoided attainder, while from the south-east sector, George Brown, John Fogge, John Darell, John Guildford and Thomas Lewkenor, knights, were proscribed, along with John and Nicholas Gaynesford, Richard Guildford, Thomas Fiennes, Richard Haute, Edward Poynings and William Brandon esquires. Those who avoided attainder from the Kent sector of revolt include Sir Thomas Bourghier, Sir John Scott, Sir William Haute and Sir William Brandon, together with John Wingfield esquire and John Norris. These men form the core of the following discussion. Others will be used at times to help make certain points.

It is a truism that within the various communities in fifteenth-century England the gentry's social and political affiliations were influenced to a great degree by the pattern of landholding, and, by the kinship network. In recent years historians exploring the social and administrative organization of local societies in order to identify their power structures, have found that - whether lineage based or free from resident lordship - a high degree of social cohesion was facilitated by kinship ties; these ties gave rise to shared landed interests and a range of reciprocal activity within the counties and the regions. Further, the same families played an integral role in county and regional administration, reinforcing links while simultaneously improving their social standing among their peers. This was the case in Devonshire, Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Leicestershire, Derbyshire, Richmondshire, Cheshire and Lancashire, at various times in the fifteenth century.¹ While the evidence for social cohesion among the gentry within the shires has been drawn largely from midland and northern studies, it is also applicable in a much wider context throughout southern England in

¹. M. Cherry, 'The Struggle for Power in mid-fifteenth century Devonshire', in *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces*, ed. R. A. Griffiths (Gloucester, 1981), p. 124; C. Carpenter, 'The Beauchamp Affinity: A study of bastard feudalism at work', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XCV (London, 1980), pp. 514-18; S. M. Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century* (Chesterfield, 1983), p. 93; Bennett, *Community, Class and Careerism: Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, chapter 2; A. J. Pollard, 'The Richmondshire Community of Gentry during the Wars of the Roses', pp. 37-56; see also I.D. Rowney, 'The Staffordshire Political Community 1440-1500', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Keele (1981); E. Acheson, 'The Leicestershire gentry in the Fifteenth Century c. 1422-1485', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of New England (1979).

the later fifteenth century. In most areas, relatively, the nobles were few; the gentry were 'thick on the ground' with many whose wealth and power rivalled the lesser barons; here, unlike areas in midland and northern counties, whole regions were almost free from resident nobles, or else free from politically 'active' nobles. In the absence of solid magnate 'presence' and given the wealth and standing of the gentry, these men were lords in their own domain.

The high degree of social cohesion within the counties studied was largely the result of marriage alliances; these alliances, in turn, accounted for a large measure of interdependence in property transactions. An insight into the complexity of the kinship network is gained from a brief survey of leading families in the South West and the South East.² In the West Country for example, Thomas Arundel, Henry Bodrugan, John Trevelyan, Edward Courtenay, the Reskymers, Chidiocks and Champernownes were all - in varying degrees - interrelated; they were also bound by marriage to Somerset knights, Giles Daubenay and John St Lo and Sir Robert Willoughby of Devon.³ In Wiltshire, John Cheyney of Falleston, was a kinsman of Gloucestershire knight, William Berkeley, both men having married Chidiock coheiresses; this, in turn, linked Cheyney with Robert Poyntz through the Berkeley-Poyntz connection and, more distantly, with Sir John St Lo (whose great-aunt, daughter of John St Lo d. 1375, had married Sir John Chidiock).⁴ Still in Wiltshire, the Delamares (also from Berkshire) and the Somerset Paulets were related, as were the former with the Poynings and the Dorsetshire Mortons.⁵ Sir Roger Tocotes had married Elizabeth Braybrook, the step-mother of rebel Richard Beauchamp, Lord St Amand.⁶ From Dorset, Sir Nicholas Latimer and William Hody of Somerset were also kinsmen, Latimer having married Hody's sister, Jane, while John

2. The focus here is on the sample of leading gentry: fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen.

3. See above Chapter 3, pp. 115-6 for Bodrugan-Trevelyan and Arundel-Courtenay ties; see also *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 4, A 10006, A 7041 and 10107, for Reskymmer-Arundel alliance; for Willoughby-Champernowne ties, Gilbert, *op.cit.*, pp. 469-70.

4. For Berkeley-Poyntz see above, Chapter 3, p. 38; see, in general, L. F. Salzman, 'Sussex Domesday Tenants: The Family of Chesney or Cheyney', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, Vol. 65 (1924); for St Lo-Chidiock, *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 8, p. 149.

5. *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 4, p. 337, for Paulet-Lewkenor; earlier in the century Sir Ellis Delamare's sister had married the grandfather of Sir Amias Paulet; for the Morton-Delamare link, Frideswide, the wife of Dorsetshire John Morton was the cousin and heir of Sir Thomas Delamare: *C.I.P.M.*, no. 1140.

6. For Daubenay-Arundel, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f. 235r; for Tocotes-Beauchamp, P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, f. 132r; Richard Beauchamp, Lord St Amand will be included among the gentry rebels.

Trenchard esquire, married his friend's widow, Margery Cheverell after John Cheverell's death.⁷ From Devon and Cornwall Sir Robert Willoughby and John Cheyney were affines through the former's mother, the daughter and coheiress of Edward Cheyney esquire; while both men were tied to Sir Humphrey Stafford, briefly earl of Devon in 1469, and Willoughby with Cheyney's kinsman was described by the earl as his cousin.⁸ In Gloucestershire the Mortons (with kin in Dorset) and Twynyhos were connected; and in Wiltshire, Sir Thomas Melbourne, whose uncle was lawyer and rebel, Michael Skilling, was also related to Sir Thomas St Leger (influential in the west from the 1470s) linking him with a powerful circle of Kentish gentry.⁹

The pattern prevailed in Kent, Surrey and Sussex where most of the leading gentry married within their region: John Pympe of Nettlestead, Kent, was at the centre of a group bound by marriage including his cousins, Sir Thomas, James and Bartholomew St Leger; as well his stepfather, Sir John Guildford, his brother-in-law, Richard Guildford, his 'cousins' Edmund and George Guildford and Sir John Cheyney.¹⁰ Sir George Brown from Betchworth, Surrey (stepson of Thomas Vaughan, executed in June 1483) was stepfather to Edward Poynings (having married his mother, Elizabeth Paston, widow of Robert Poynings) and mixed with prominent East Anglian gentry including William Knyvet.¹¹ The connection between the two families

-
7. *Wedgwood*, p. 527; for Trenchard-Cheverell, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 1114; Willoughby's maternal grandmother was the daughter and coheiress of Henry Stafford, see *C.P.*, Vol. XII, Part II, p. 660.
 8. Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 468-70, 533; *C.P.*, Vol. XII, Part II, p. 660; *V.C.H.*, Wiltshire, Vol. 8, p. 151; for 'cousin' connection with Stafford, *P.R.O.*, Prob 11/5, f. 241v.
 9. John Twynyho died in 1486; his heir was Dorothy Morton, see *V.C.H.*, Gloucestershire, Vol. 7, p. 113; for Melbourne, *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/9, f. 178v.
 10. *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/11, fos. 21v-r; in relation to the arrangement of arms in the parish church of Nettlestead, the arms of St Leger, Cheyney and Pympe 'come first in by marriage'. Sir John Guildford married the widow of John Pympe c. 1455; his son, Richard, married the daughter of his step-mother. There were other links among the Home Counties. Prominent Oxfordshire knight, Sir Edmund Rede, had married John Gaynesford's mother; his step-daughter (Gaynesford's sister) had married Wiltshire rebel, William Hall, who was associated with leading Kentish gentry.
 11. See *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/8, fos. 97v-r for Dame Elizabeth Brown's will; Poynings was also related to Sir John Scott who describes him as 'my son': *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/7, f. 116v; see also Agnes Scott's will, 'to my daughter Elizabeth Poynings...', *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/8, f. 126r; see also the will of Sir Edmund Bedingfield who names knights Edward Poynings and William Scott, 'my brethren in law' as his supervisors: *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/11, f. 64r; for Brown-Knyvet, *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 354. In East Anglia the gentry were also tightly bound by kinship ties. In Suffolk for example, John Wingfield

continued long after Brown's death in 1483. Sir John Scott, of Snave, Kent, was the father-in-law of Edward Poynings;¹² Richard Guildford and John Darell of Kent were first cousins, while Guildford's daughter married Sir William Haute (whose uncle was executed in June, 1483).¹³ Sir John Fogge had married Alice Haute, connecting him with Sir William Haute and Richard Guildford, and through the latter in terms of kinship ties, with the St Leger, Pympe and Cheyney circle. ¹⁴ Sir Thomas Bourghier was the son-in-law of Sir Thomas Vaughan, uniting him with Sir George Brown. Joan Morrisby, widow of John Gaynesford (son, or cousin of the rebel) married Robert Brent of Wiversburgh, Kent, while the sister of Sir Thomas Cobham was known to be 'dwelling with John Gaynesford'.¹⁵

As the landed survey has shown, almost all the wealthiest gentry were large local landowners who consolidated their holdings within their county or region through a union with a wealthy local heiress. Many alliances forged among the gentry were of generations standing, and most enjoyed the reciprocity of service which they facilitated. In fact the large estates resulting from such matches allied the local leaders and allowed a framework for mutual cooperation in the running of their daily lives. Most devoted considerable time and energy to

esquire was a kinsman of William Brandon, through his aunt Elizabeth's marriage to Brandon's father, Sir William. His sister Katherine, married Robert, son of Sir Thomas Brewes of Little Wenham, Suffolk, while his cousin, the above-mentioned William Brandon married Elizabeth Bruyn; Brewes' sister, in turn, married John Paston III. For Sir Edmund Rede's will, *Some Oxfordshire Wills, Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1393-1510*, ed. J.R.H. Weaver and A. Beardwood (1958), p. 46; see P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 198v for Dame Katherine's will; see also P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 27v-r for the will of Elizabeth Pellican of West Malling, Kent, which suggests ties between the Pympes and Redes as well as the Gaynesfords; for Norris-Harcourt connection, *V.C.H., Berkshire*, Vol. 4, p. 127; for the Morton-Forster connection, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 149r-150v and P.R.O., Prob. 11/12, fos. 157r-158v; for Shaa, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 301r-302r; see also Sir Edmund Shaa's will, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f. 102v; Elizabeth Brandon's executor was her brother, William Wingfield, see P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 75v; for the complexity of the Wingfield family tree see P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, fos. 77r-78v; see also Wingfield, *op.cit.*, p. 18. Brewes's sister married John Paston III: *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, nos. 304, 375 378.

12. P.R.O., Prob. 11/15, f. 116v; for Brown-Knyvet, R. Jeffs, 'The Poynings-Percy Dispute', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. 34 (1961), p. 159.

13. P.R.O., Prob. 11/17, f. 225r, for Sir Richard Guildford's will; see also Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 115; *Memorials*, no. 154.

14. See Bolton, *op.cit.* and Wedgwood, p. 245.

15. For Bourghier-Vaughan link, P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, fos. 18v-19r; for Morrisby-Brent, Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 113; for Cobham-Gaynesford, P.R.O., Prob. 11/6, fos. 13r-15v.

local tasks from witnessing land dealings to acting as feoffees, executors and, at times, arbiters. The sheer volume of these actions demonstrates the complexity of kinship ties, the gentry's standing, and the richness of their lives at both the regional and county level. To reveal all such connections would be needlessly repetitious. Yet some detail is necessary to convey both the complexity and geographical diversity of gentry activity. The following discussion will focus briefly on a region, a county and several localities.¹⁶

Mutual service between the wealthiest kin and friends transcended county boundaries. In the West Country, for example, the leading gentry established 'regional' identities through their range of activity in neighbouring shires. In the 1460s Cornish esquire, Richard Nanfan was mainpernor for, among others, Somerset knight John Colshull. Dorset lawyer John Calowe, was a trustee for John Newbury of Somerset in 1478 and 1481. Wiltshire knight, Roger Tocotes, the Darell brothers (from Wiltshire and Gloucestershire) and Devon esquire, John Willoughby, witnessed numerous land transactions in Wiltshire in the 1460s and 1470s for local identities, esquires William Kayser and William Gore.¹⁷ Willoughby's brother, Sir Robert acted on behalf of Wiltshire-based Sir Edmund Hungerford in 1475. Ten years earlier, Hungerford's cousin, Sir Thomas had engaged the services of leading Somerset lawyer, Sir Richard Choke to witness his agreement with Thomas Roger of Wiltshire and his wife, Cecilia. In 1468 Cornish knight Sir John Arundel, and Wiltshire's John Cheyney were trustees for kinsman, William Reskymer in his dealings with Cornish esquire, Henry Bodrugan; while in 1475, Devon's Sir Thomas Fulford and Philip Courtenay acted as trustees for the latter's cousin, Edward Courtenay's West Country estates. In 1480, Sir Giles Daubenay of Somerset, his neighbours, lawyers John Heron and John Biconell, with Gloucestershire based attorney, John Twynhyo acted in a land transaction for local individual, Walter Mitchell.¹⁸ In 1486, Sir Thomas

16. While several of these transactions occurred after the period under discussion, the nature of business clearly indicates associations of long-standing, not simply originating in 1483.

17. For Nanfan-Colshull, *Wedgwood*, p. 623; for Calowe-Newbury, *Wedgwood*, p. 148; for Tocotes-Willoughby-Darell, H.M.C., Dublin, Various Collections: MSS of Major Moneykyrle, preserved at Homme House, Much Marcle, Herefordshire, H.M.S.O. (1907), Vol. 4, p. 125; *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, C 641, C 1104.

18. For Hungerford-Willoughby, Add. Ch. 40057; see also *ibid.*, 40054, where Sir Edmund Hungerford, John Cheyney, William Twynyho and Choke witnessed an indenture between Lond Hungerford and his son Arnold in 1452. For Arundel-Cheyney-Reskymer-Bodrugan, *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 4, A 10046, A 10347; for earlier ties see *ibid.*, A 10006: the original indenture between Reskymer and Arundel was witnessed by Sir William Bodrugan in 1439; see also *ibid.*, A 7041, A 10107. In 1481, Cheyney with his neighbour Sir Roger Tocotes of Bromham, witnessed a transaction involving the Somerset lands of Sir Thomas Burgh: W.H. Turner and H.O. Coxe,

Urswick with Biconell - friends of long standing - were trustees for the Cornish lands of Henry Marney esquire and Isabel, widow of John Norris, while Sir Giles Daubenay oversaw the will of his affine, Sir William Berkeley.¹⁹ The previous year Biconell and Daubenay had conducted property affairs following Sir Thomas Arundel's death.²⁰ His own neighbour, lawyer John Higon of Whitstanton had acted as his trustee from 1475.²¹

Generally speaking, this type of activity marked the wealthiest landed gentry in the South,²² reflecting the vast power and wider-ranging kinship connections of men whose

Calendar of Charters and Rolls preserved in the Bodleian Library, Somersetshire Charter 1 (Oxford, 1878); for Fulford-Courtenay see *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, B 120.

19. For Fulford-Courtenay see *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, B 1201, p. 329; for Haute-Urswick-Biconell, *ibid.*, no. 1230, p. 508; for Daubenay-Berkeley, P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, f. 191v; for Lewkenor-Daubenay-Biconell connection of 1478, C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 474; for Mitchell et.al., C.I.P.M., no. 257, p. 114; for other examples of Daubenay's contacts alone: *ibid.*, nos. 548, 754, 760, 923.

20. P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 235r-236v. John Biconell was granted the 'guidance and keeping' of Arundel's son. Arundel was yet another of Daubenay's relatives.

21. *Wedgwood*, p. 480.

22. In the South East others were equally busy, and while some of the following information is post-1483, most of the activity stemmed from kinship connections of years standing: Sir Edward Poynings was overseer of the will of his kinsman, Sir John Scott, executor for his mother, Dame Elizabeth (Sir George Brown's widow) and also for his step-brother Sir Anthony Brown, for which he received a standing cup of silver and gilt. Poynings, Richard Guildford and John Darell were trustees for John Pympe's lands in Kent; Sir John Cheyney (active in the East as well as the West) was a trustee for William Allington and overseer of the will of John Roger's widow; William Brent was a trustee for Sir John Guildford; Nicholas Gaynesford, himself a witness for William Fisser, appointed his 'good master' Sir John Risley as his overseer, for which Risley received Gaynesford's 'brace of greyhounds and...[his] crossbowe'; Gaynesford and his father, with Brent, Sir William Haute and others were trustees for Alexander Clifford. Knights John Fogge and John Wood were executors for Wood's kinsman; John Darell the same for Sir Richard Guildford and Richard Brocas for Richard Lessy. In East Anglia, Sir Thomas Montgomery chose as executors knights Thomas Tyrell and Edward Berkeley; Elizabeth Brandon of Suffolk, the widow of Sir William selected her brother-in-law, Sir Thomas and her brother William Wingfield as her executors; James Hobart acted for Sir Robert Radcliffe and profited as did the Knyvets and Edward Browne whose service to kinswoman, Dame Thomasina Hopton, widow of John Hopton esquire, brought cash gifts. For Scott's will, P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, f. 116v; Poynings as executor for his mother, P.R.O., Prob. 11/15, f. 116v. For Cheyney's connection with Allington and Roger's widow: P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 17r-v; P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, fos. 251v-r; for Brent-Guildford,

interests were regional rather than localised; narrowing the focus, men of this stature together with their 'county cousins' whose horizons were smaller, enjoyed the benefits of mutual activity within their principal county. In Oxfordshire, for example, most of the richest families including the Stonors, Harcourts, Redes (also of Buckinghamshire), Crofts (also of Herefordshire), Hampdens, Fowlers, Forsters, Danvers and Barantynes were bound through marriage ties and landed interests. As prominent knights and esquires, they joined forces with lesser men across the shire and promoted a mutually beneficial framework for interaction.²³

As one of the most successful and well-connected Oxfordshire families, the Stonors were much in demand as witnesses and trustees.²⁴ In 1461 Thomas Stonor II witnessed a land transaction for kinsman Edmund Rede, with Richard Harcourt, Sir Edmund Hampden and more; he was so engaged by another relation, Humphrey Forster, and soon after witnessed a 'deal' between William Fowler, the latter's son, Richard, and wealthy local merchant, Richard Quatermaine.²⁵ In 1482, Sir William Stonor received from John Hampden, a grant of 'Dudcote'

P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, f. 223v; for Gaynesford-Fissher, Gaynesford-Risley, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 43r-44v; P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 216v-r; for Poynings-Guildford-Darell, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 1235. For Fogge-Wood, P.R.O., Prob. 11/5, fos. 211r-v; for Darrell-Guildford, P.R.O., Prob. 11/7; for Brocas-Lessy, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 216v-r. John Brocas had married Anne, daughter of the wealthy John Roger the younger (d. 1486); after Brocas's death, Anne married John Tuchet, Lord Audley: *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 4, p. 283; for Clifford, *C.C.R.*, 1467-76, no. 996; P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, fos. 175v-177r; P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 75v. For Radcliffe-Hobart, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 186v; for Hopton, Knyvet and Brown, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11 fos. 151r-v.

23. The sister of Sir William Stonor's aunt by marriage, had married Sir Robert Harcourt (d. 1470) brother of Sir Richard of Stanton Harcourt; the mother of Edmund Hampden's kinsman, Sir Edmund, had married Sir William Stonor's uncle, Sir Ralph Stonor: *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xix; Thomas Fowler's sister-in-law was Jane Danvers; Humphrey Forster had married Stonor's aunt, whose brother, John, had married Anne, the sister of Sir Robert Harcourt's wife, Margery: see *Wedgwood*, for details. The Danvers, prominent legal careerists had intermarried with the Quatermaines and Barantynes, wealthy county gentry; Humphrey Forster, leading Oxfordshire lawyer had married Alice, William Stonor's sister: *Wedgwood*, p. 344; John Harcourt, grandson of Sir Robert had married Anne Norris, daughter of John and niece of Sir William of Bray, Berkshire with substantial lands and interests in Oxfordshire: *Wedgwood*, p. 421

24. By the 1470s such was the Stonors' power that they were able to look further than the Oxfordshire marriage market; yet from early in the preceding century they had married well, and mainly within the county.

25. *The Boarstall Cartulary*, ed. H. Salter (Oxford, 1930), p. 39; for Stonor-Forster, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 413; for Stonor-Fowler-Quatermaine, *C.C.R.*, 1454-1461, p. 268. For the correspondence of Thomas Stonor

manor, and later in the year was released from a recognisance entered into by him on behalf of Peter Marmion of Thame, for £500.²⁶ Yet others were as busy. The Danvers, Harcourts and Crofts had acted often for each other as trustees from the late 1450s.²⁷ In the late 1460s Thomas Croft was an executor for his brother's sister-in-law, Dame Katherine Harcourt, and a trustee for Isabel, wife of William Paulet and widow of his kinsman, Edward Harcourt. The Gaynesfords, Redes and Hampdens also assisted kin in this way, while records attest the activity of the Harcourts, Crofts, Quatermaines and Danvers as witnesses, overseers and executors for a number of lesser gentry families.²⁸

Clearly social cohesion was fostered in Oxfordshire through the leading gentry's connections with similarly-placed families, and with their more locally-based affines. Yet the sort of network which promoted such cohesion within the county, operated on an even more localised basis, and it is possible to identify smaller units of gentry interaction within prescribed areas in southern England. While many leading gentry sought broad horizons, much of their time was spent in the vicinity of a powerful kinsman or neighbour, who might support their case in a variety of activity. In the west Wiltshire borderland, for example, lesser gentry from Corsham to Mere were part of a network dominated by the Hungerfords of Heytesbury. Lawyer, Thomas Tropenell, was well-placed at Hindon, about eight miles south of Heytesbury, as Lord Hungerford's agent and a trustee and later an executor for Lady Hungerford in 1476. Careerist lawyers such as John Wittocksmead, Henry Long, Michael Skilling and the prosperous John Mompesson acted with and for Sir Walter Hungerford, and his kin, in a mutually enriching framework.²⁹ In central Somerset Sir Giles Daubenay was at the centre of a

with among others Thomas Hampden, Humphrey Forster, Richard Quartermaine and Sir Richard Harcourt, see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, nos. 75, 87, 89, 94, 110, 115, 116; *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, nos. 179, 182, 197.

26. *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, C 1541; for Stonor-Marmion, *ibid.*, C 2320.

27. C.C.R., 1454-1461, p. 133; C.I.P.M., nos. 163, 168.

28. Originally from Surrey, William Gaynesford witnessed the will of his kinsman, Sir Edmund Rede, while his brother George was an executor for Rede's widow; Thomas Hampden was executor for John Barantyne in 1474. For Harcourt-Paulet, *Early Chancery Proceedings, Lists and Indexes*, Vol. 2, Bundle 40, 1467-72, no. 113; for Hampden-Barantyne, Weaver ed., *op.cit.*, p. 34. and *passim* for other activity.

29. *Wedgwood*, pp. 550, 600, 875, 944; *Memorials* no. 331 Wittocksmead, Long and Mompesson were all Hungerford trustees. Michael Skilling, another lawyer, had close connections with the family through whom he represented Heytesbury in 1478: *Wedgwood*, p. 772. For others living in proximity: Thomas Hall, gentleman of Trowbridge and William Walrond esquire of Monkton Farleigh.

group which included the distinguished Thomas Champeney, John Tremayle, John Stowell, John Heron, William Brent, William Case, William Hody, John Biconell and John Higons.³⁰ In west Sussex the same pattern is evident. Here the earl of Arundel and leading knight Henry Rose of West Grinstead were at the heart of a community which included esquires John Dudley (second son of Lord Dudley) and Thomas Coombes, and lesser men, John James, William Jope and John Chamber.³¹ Further east the Fiennes of Hurstmonceaux were the focus of a group, while in Kent and Surrey, small communities revolved around leading gentry such as the Guildfords, Culpeppers, Pympe, Hautes, Fogge and more.³²

As the discussion has demonstrated, leading gentry families in the South were part of a kinship network in which mutual concerns were satisfied within the limits of local society. The co-operation and service of the gentry in daily affairs highlights the existence of a framework of trust. Yet, not all was smooth sailing. In a society where landed interests were so fully entwined, overlapping concerns sometimes materialized in the form of disputes between relatives and neighbours. In most cases however, the gentry could draw successful arbitrators from within their own ranks to compose their quarrels. Some of the gentry had powerful allies like Sir William Stonor's kinsman, Sir Richard Fowler (elder brother of the above-mentioned Thomas) who acted as arbiter in a family dispute between Stonor and John Cottismore in 1474. The panel of arbitrators also included one of the Harcourt brothers and Sir Edmund Rede.³³ The following year another quarrel again centering on Stonor involved mediators Richard Fowler, William Danvers and Humphrey Forster. Stonor, having been granted the right to perform the will by his father's executors was thwarted by his mother. Arbitration was successful however,

30. See above, notes 19-20, for Daubenay contacts and gentry interaction.

31. See P.R.O., Prob. 11/12, for Dudley's will and bequest 'to my special good lord of Arundel'; for Jope, P.R.O., C67/51/8; for Coombes, *Wedgwood*, p. 210.

32. See below, Chapter 5, pp. 30-1, for a discussion of the implications of the pardon rolls in this context. This trend is evident in all counties.

33. *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 141; Fowler was the King's solicitor from 1461-70 and chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, 1471-77. Stonor was again in trouble in 1477, when he was charged with instigating trouble at Fawley. Presumably, as with other incidents, his lands were at the heart of the matter. This was not always the case with others. Sir Thomas Cheyney, for example, was sued by Buckinghamshire's William de Broc (d. 1476) for 'breaking into his house and killing his dog'; in Sussex, the Culpepper brothers - Nicholas and Richard - found themselves in deep water after abducting Elizabeth and Margaret Wakehurst, the daughters of their neighbour. Yet all was, apparently, resolved. Nicholas and Elizabeth had eighteen children, the eldest of whom, Richard, inherited Wakehurst on his mother's death in 1517; see *Materials*, pp. 523-4 for Stonor, *V.C.H., Buckinghamshire*, Vol. 3, p. 212 and *V.C.H., Sussex*, Vol. 7, p. 129.

and both William and his mother 'claimed to be satisfied'.³⁴ Years earlier Stonor's father Thomas, along with Sir Robert Harcourt and Sir Edmund Rede witnessed the successful mediation of a dispute by Richard Harcourt in Oxfordshire.³⁵ Arbitration was also successful in the West Country where John Trevalyan acted as mediator between Calais merchant John Batte and Thomas Bodulgate, and years later in 1482, when Sir Giles Daubenay was final arbiter in a dispute between Somerset merchants Walter Dolyng and Robert Potell.³⁶ Often quarrels were composed without recourse to formal arbitration, and on occasion intimidation was a potent weapon. In this context, John Paston III had powerful kin and friends as his letter to Margaret Paston in November 1479 indicates, indeed, 'If mine unkind uncle make any masteries to gather money, arrears or other, my Master Fitzwalter, Sir Robert Wingfield, Sir Thomas Brew[es], my brother Yelverton, my brother Harcourt, and other of my friends I trust will say no to him, if they have knowledge'.³⁷ At times discussion and friendly counsel failed to achieve a settlement, as the long-standing engagement between John Paston II and Anne Haute, sister of Richard, and sister-in-law of Sir John Fogge demonstrates. Engaged in 1469, the couple - despite 'large and far communication' between Paston, Fogge, Haute and others, which in 1473 Paston felt had achieved 'a deliverance' - ended the proposed match in 1477.³⁸

Whatever else, however, these cases indicate the success of a framework which did not depend on a lord to guide the affairs of his men and could withstand and resolve friction from within. Further, the strength of these horizontal bonds within southern society was reinforced by the way in which the gentry could continue to co-operate when clearly a degree of diplomacy was required. In the West Country from the early 1460s Henry Bodrugan established something of a reputation as a pirate, whose exploits were the subject of a number of commissions of inquiry and arrest in Cornwall. In 1474, knights Thomas St Leger and Robert Willoughby, with Thomas Arundel and Edward Courtenay were members of at least two commissions aimed at Bodrugan's arrest. Yet most involved had served on earlier commissions with Bodrugan, and continued to do so. In Norfolk, Sir Robert Wingfield took Margaret Paston's part against her 'greatest enemies Brandons and his brother William'. The disputation concerning Caister Castle in Norfolk which divided the Pastons and the duke of Norfolk

34. *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxxii.

35. *C.C.R.*, 1447-54, p. 133.

36. *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 3, D 768, p. 495, for Batte-Bodulgate; for Daubenay, *ibid.*, C 3139.

37. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 383.

38. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 277.

(whose part Brandon took) and involved other leading figures, rumbled on for a number of years, during which time those involved managed to cooperate on other matters without difficulty.³⁹

This was the pattern in the Central South, where in 1468 Sir Richard Harcourt was given a grant of £20 for life for services against 'traitors' in Oxfordshire, one of whom was Thomas Danvers. Thomas's older brother Richard, associated with Harcourt in a property transaction in 1456, continued his association with Harcourt by whom he was enfeoffed in 1486.⁴⁰ Harcourt was also commissioned to round up the rebels after 'Buckingham's rebellion', one of whom was his nephew, John Harcourt. Yet this he did, and with no sign of friction judging by later records of family transactions. This was also the case with Henry Norris, son of William Norris of Speke, Lancashire, related to rebels Sir William and John Norris, whose position as Richard III's groom did not harm family ties.⁴¹

Similarly in the South East, Richard Lewkenor was commissioned with others to besiege Bodiam Castle, Sussex, in November 1483, where his nephew, Thomas was entrenched with a number of rebels. James Haute, brother of Sir William and uncle of Richard esquire, both of whom rebelled in 1483 received a grant of William's lordship of Igham Mote, Kent for his services against the rebels; yet both families continued to cooperate after Henry Tudor's accession in 1485.⁴² Just weeks after the revolt Sir Edmund Rede, esquires John and William Gaynesford and others, stood surety for rebel Nicholas Gaynesford with a bond of one hundred marks to ensure that he be 'of good bearing towards Richard...and that he shall come not

39. *Materials*, Vol. 2, pp. 384, 479, 503. Brandon the younger had a bad reputation and was in trouble in 1478, having allegedly 'ravished' an 'old gentlewoman' and one of her daughters: *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 312.

40. *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 85. Danvers was subsequently acquitted; Bodrugan was the subject of a commission of arrest in June, 1460 presided over by knights John Colshull and Hugh Courtenay, John Arundel esquire and others, see *C.P.R.*, 1452-61, p. 559; for later commission of arrest, *C.P.R.*, 1467-75, pp. 491-2; for earlier commissions including Bodrugan, *ibid.*, p. 351 in which Bodrugan worked alongside Willoughby, and *ibid.*, p. 399, which also included Sir John Arundel, John Crocker, Richard Edgecumbe, Thomas Treffry, Thomas Whalesborough, John Carminow and others. For later commissions see *C.C.R.*, 1454-61, p. 172; for Harcourt-Danvers, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 168.

41. *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 371; Henry Norris was the seventh son of Sir William of Speke, Lancashire: *ibid.*, p. 460; see also Ormerod, *op.cit.*, p. 160.

42. In fact Thomas's uncle, Richard stood surety for the rebel in May, 1484, with Sir Henry Rose and Thomas Hoo in a 1000 mark fine: *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 1242. See Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 621 for Richard Lewkenor's rewards on Henry's accession.

within the county of Kent without licence'. At times rebels forfeited their recognisance placing their kin in jeopardy: Sir William Berkeley suing for pardon in 1484, fled to Henry Tudor in Brittany leaving his uncle, Edward Berkeley esquire, in a compromising position. Clearly, however, family ties did not hinder official business, whatever its nature; nor did political differences erode successful business partnerships - or firm friendships. Avery Cornburgh, one of Richard III's props in the South after the rebellion, and his 'trusty and wellbeloved servant' retained as his trustees knights Reginald Bray, William Hody and William Knyvet. Bray and Hody were implicated in the revolt and the unrest which followed, while Knyvet was indicted with Buckingham at Brecon. Yet the political differences between Cornburgh and his trustees (chosen most probably well before his death in 1486 and acting for Cornburgh just months after Richard's death) did not prevent business, nor preclude friendship. It is also noteworthy that Sir Edmund Shaa, mayor of London during Richard's coup in June 1483, and instrumental in galvanising support for the new King, chose Reginald Bray, 'his right especial friend' as his executor in 1487.⁴³

The nature of the horizontal bonds of society facilitated 'social and [therefore] political stability' within gentry communities in the later middle ages.⁴⁴ Further, the notion of the vertical bonds of service and loyalty reinforcing the horizontal bonds of society is manifest in the gentry's composition of the disputes of their own men. In 1480, at a time when tension between England and Scotland was 'acute', Humphrey Forster wrote to his nephew Sir William Stonor informing him that his tenant's brother, '...dwelling at Rysborough should be attacked for a Scot by servants of yours, where indeed he is none...I beseech you to show your favourable mastership to them as conscience and right require...' Provision was also made for those who had fallen on hard times. Hampshire yeoman of the crown, William Knight, was secure in the knowledge that his 'good friend' William Heydon, would support him in death: Knight with 'little money left', required Heydon to be his executor and 'to take upon him to bury [Knight]...at his cost'.⁴⁵

There were attempts at checks and balances on both the horizontal and vertical bonds of society, through which the gentry sought to protect their affairs after death. Caveats were sometimes created to ensure adherence to the terms of a will, and to protect family members from exploitation - most often by other family members. In this context William Brett

⁴³. For Cornburgh, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f. 20r; for Shaa, P.R.O., Prob 11/8, f. 120v; for quotation, P.R.O., E 404/78/3/63.

⁴⁴. G. L. Harriss, introd. to K. B. McFarlane, *England in the Fifteenth Century*, (London, 1981) p. xxiv.

⁴⁵. *Supplementary Stonor Letters and Papers (1314-1482)*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (London, 1923), no. 355; P.R.O., Prob. 11/12, f. 148r.

cautioned his executors that if his wife married 'any man under the age of forty year or being not of substance both lands and goods like unto herself then... she shall not be my executrix nor meddle with my lands and goods nor with my children'.⁴⁶ Sir Thomas Melbourne left instructions that if either of his children tampered with his testament, their cash bequests of £20 and 200 marks would 'cease'.⁴⁷ Dame Maud Courtenay stipulated that her son Sir Hugh would inherit half her plate on condition that neither he or his heirs interfered with her will.⁴⁸ Sir Robert Radcliffe's daughters could marry only with the assent of his executors, and then to men of yearly landed wealth in excess of 200 marks.⁴⁹ Sir Richard Haute bequeathed to his 'little son Henry' a substantial block of lands 'provided as well that my loving mother abide at Swasling'.⁵⁰ Others stood to forfeit gifts if their service was unsatisfactory: Thomas Oxenbridge cautioned his executors that if Lord Dacre would 'not be good lord' to his trustees and executors for seven years after his decease then his 'best standing cup of silver and gilt' promised to his godson Master Fiennes, the 'same cup remain unto...[his] executors'. Sir Roger Tocotes bequeathed his 'right honourable lord Richard Beauchamp, Lord St Amand' a cloth of gold and other treasures on condition that he 'not hurt nor withdraw no manner of...goods' but deliver 'the same' to his executors.⁵¹

Despite these tactics against real or perceived transgressions after death, the regions, counties and small communities displayed a framework for social cohesion and gentry solidarity in which the affairs of both the greater and lesser gentry were conducted, and in which their interests were protected and defended by leading knights and esquires. In the absence of powerful and intrusive nobles, these men led society, supervised business and resolved conflict. This framework of solidarity served the gentry well in 1483 when they came together in revolt against Richard III.

Gentry interaction is manifest in another facet of county and regional society: the co-operation of leading knights and esquires in the offices of local government.⁵² Throughout the

46. P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, fos. 254r-255v.

47. P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, fos. 177r-178v.

48. P.R.O., Prob. 11/5, fos. 172v-r.

49. P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 184r.

50. P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, f. 164r.

51. P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 43r-44v; for Tocotes-St Amand, P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, f. 153r.

52. It is not proposed to explore at this stage the men selected as sheriffs, peace commissioners or commissioners of array. While commissions of enquiry, arrest, oyer and terminer and so on usually included leading gentry, those selected for the shrievalty and especially the peace commissions were always men most highly regarded by the crown. These offices will be included

Middle Ages the crown was heavily reliant on the knowledge and expertise of the gentry for the maintenance of law and order at the local level. 'A rich blend of local knowledge and careerist skills' provided the central administration with a force of able administrators who served on commissions of inquiry, arrest and gaol delivery, as well as those involved in the supervision of building projects, or clearing within the localities. Focussing on the South West in the 1470s, it is easy to establish another stratum of activity which united the leading gentry. Those who met most regularly on commissions during the period include knights Thomas St Leger, Robert Willoughby, Giles Daubenay, Thomas Fulford, John Crocker, John Arundel, together with the Courtenays - Hugh, Philip and William; esquires, William Berkeley, William Uvedale, Edward Courtenay, Thomas Arundel, Richard Edgecombe, John Nanfan, John Halwell, John Cheyney, Walter Hungerford, Robert Poyntz, John Hals, Charles Dinham; and gentlemen, John Biconell, William Hody, John Heron, John Hignons and William Frost.⁵³

What is interesting is the geographical diversity of the gentry's activity. Not only were the leading families mutually dependent and politically 'active' in a variety of ways within

later in the discussion. Because of their nature, the commissions of array form an important theme to be developed in Part 3.

53. C.P.R., 1476-85, Devon, commission of arrest, November, 1473, p. 408: Sir Thomas St Leger, William and Philip Courtenay, Thomas Fulford, John Crocker and Robert Willoughby knights; *ibid.*, November, 1474, p. 492, Cornwall, arrest of pirates in Fowey: St Leger, Willoughby, Edward Courtenay, Thomas Arundel, Thomas Beaumont; *ibid.*, March 16, 1478, inquiry into the duke of Clarence's lands in Devon, and Cornwall: St Leger, Willoughby, Halwell, March 16, 1478; *ibid.*, p. 108-9 in Somerset, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall; and *ibid.*, pp. 108-9, inquiry into Clarence's Devon lands: Halwell, St Leger, Willoughby, Crocker, Charles Dinham esquire, John Hals esquire; inquiry into Fulk Fitzwaryn's lands, *ibid.*, p. 183: St Leger, John Biconell; Southampton inquiry into escape of felons, *ibid.*, p. 263: St Leger, William Berkeley, William Uvedale; Cornwall, commission of oyer and terminer, 1470: John Halwell, John Arundel and Hugh Courtenay; *ibid.*, Cornwall and Devon: John Halwell and Hugh Courtenay, William Courtenay, Thomas Fulford; Devon, Commission of arrest: Halwell, Hugh and William Courtenay and Fulford; *ibid.*, p. 251; *ibid.*, Devon, inquiry into felonies, 1477, p. 51; Devon, Somerset, inquiry into felonies: Willoughby, St Leger, Crocker, John Fortescue; John Biconell, William Hody, *ibid.*, p. 464, July, 1474; Cornwall commission of arrest: Willoughby, St Leger, Richard Edgecombe, Thomas Fulford, Edward Courtenay, Thomas Arundel...to arrest Henry Bodrigan 'for divers felonies'; Southampton, inquiry into Clarence's lands: esquires John Cheyney, William Berkeley, Walter Hungerford and William Collingbourne, *ibid.*, p. 109; Southampton, 'walls and ditches', John Cheyney esquire, William Knyvett and others, *ibid.*, July, 1478, p. 113; Somerset commission of arrest: Sir Giles Daubenay, John Biconell, John Hignons and John Heron, *ibid.*, December, 1477, p. 79.

their county and/or region, but their support and service straddled the regions, indicating the breadth of their kinship ties, the extent of their landed wealth and the range of their contacts. It also provides an insight into the nature of their political adventurism.

In terms of interaction linking the regions, in 1465 Robert Willoughby, far from home, was a trustee in Norfolk with prominent lawyers William Jenney, Richard Southwell and John Heydon; in 1478 Sir Giles Daubenay, Thomas Arundel, John Biconell, William Hody and others were trustees with Sussex knight, Sir Thomas Lewkenor for his mother; Sir Maurice Berkeley of Gloucestershire acted in a Norfolk land dealing with Sir Robert Wingfield; later his son, Sir William witnessed the will of Kentish esquire Richard Haute; Sir John Fogge of Kent was the guardian of Robert Arundel of Trecice, Cornwall; Sir William Berkeley from the West witnessed Richard Haute's will in the East; Sir Thomas St Leger with Thomas Uvedale and others witnessed transactions in Southampton and was a trustee there for John Wodeham with Sir Thomas Bourghier with whom he acted in London along with John Forster and others for Elizabeth Cook, daughter of Philip Malpas.⁵⁴ John Biconell, busy in the South West, was an executor for Richard Pigot and a trustee for Sir John Wingfield.⁵⁵ His colleague, William Hody was a trustee in Sussex for Richard Guildford and others, a witness in Berkshire for Sir William Norris, and in London for citizen and tailor, Thomas Donnington;⁵⁶ Norris's brother, John, acted with West Country knights John St Lo and Edmund Hungerford in Berkshire; Essex knight Thomas Tyrell selected Sir Thomas Urswick as an executor and Richard Haute as his overseer;⁵⁷ Norfolk's William Paston, based in London chose Daubenay and Poynings (the latter his nephew) as executors; Poynings oversaw the will of Norfolk knight Edmund Bedingfield, while Edward Berkeley was executor for East Anglian Sir Thomas Montgomery.

54. For Willoughby, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 471; for Lewkenor, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 474 (1482); for Maurice Berkeley-Robert Wingfield, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 118, (1472); Fogge received the custody, lands and marriage of Robert Arundel, son and heir of John Arundel of Trecice, Cornwall, see *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 328, and also *The Registers of Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1466-1491, and Richard Fox, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1492-1494*, ed. H.C., Maxwell Lyte, Somerset Record Society, Vol. LII, No. 808 (1937); for Berkeley-Haute, *P.R.O. Prob.* 11/9, f. 164r; for St Leger-Uvedale, *B.L. Add. Charters*, 40,266; for St Leger-Bourghier, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 589; for Elizabeth Cook, *ibid.*, no. 475, p. 136 (1479).

55. For Biconell-Piggott, *P.R.O., Prob.* 11/10, f. 102v (15 April, 1483); for Biconell-Wingfield, *Ancient Deeds*, Vol.2, C 2550 (Cambridge, 1481).

56. For Hody-Guildford, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 664 (1480); for Hody-Norris, *ibid.*, no. 749 (1481) for Hody-Donnington, *ibid.*, p. 153 (1479).

57. For Tyrell-Urswick-Haute, *P.R.O., Prob.* 11/6, fos. 237r-238v (1475).

Sir George Brown, Sir John Scott and John Pympe were also associated with the Pastons, William Knyvet and many other leading figures.⁵⁸

John Forster and Robert Morton, based in London, but also from Hertfordshire and Dorset, respectively, were executors for Agnes Forster in Gloucestershire.⁵⁹ Oxfordshire's Sir William Stonor witnessed the will of Kentish knight William Haute, who, in turn, was one of Stonor's trustees along with his brother, James for his lands in Kent; Stonor was also a trustee with Sir George Brown in London for John Chacombe, and conducted a business transaction on behalf of his deceased aunt, with John Rushe of London (who, incidentally, served John Paston, Margaret Beaufort's first cousin) and also with Richard Fitzlewis of Bardewell, Suffolk; in addition Stonor conducted business with Wiltshire esquire, John Cheyney.⁶⁰ From Surrey, Richard Gaynesford was executor for Northamptonshire esquire, John Hulcote, while knights George Darell and John Willoughby based in the West, were trustees with Kentish esquire Richard Haute.⁶¹

The framework which facilitated gentry support both within and across the regions was recognised and utilised by the crown particularly during 'difficult' periods, to satisfy, among other things, debts incurred. Thomas Arundel's father, Sir John, having supported the Readeption of 1470-1, was fined 6000 marks by Edward IV as a penalty for his defection from the crown. Arundel having raised 2000 marks, the King then nominated as his guarantors knights John Fogge, Richard Harcourt, Ralph Verney and William Hampton along with Thomas Stonor, Richard Fowler, Alfred Cornburgh and others. Gerard Camsion was assigned the residue of the fine by the King. Arundel's own trustees, Sir Giles Daubenay, John Biconell, William Huddesfield and William Hody were enfeoffed, in turn, by Harcourt after Arundel's death to satisfy the remainder of the debt. Importantly this episode involved powerful men

58. P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 102v; for Berkeley-Montgomery, P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, fos. 175v-177r; for Poynings-Bedingfield, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 63r-64v.

59. P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, fos. 65v-66v.

60. For Haute-Stonor, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 1175; for Stonor-Brown-Chacombe, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 311 (1478); for Stonor-Rush, *ibid.*, no. 1002; for Rushe-Paston, *Wedgwood*, p. 667; for Stonor-Fitzlewis, *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, C 1607 (1475); for Stonor-Cheyney, see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 287; in April, 1481 Walter Elmes wrote to Stonor that 'John Cheyney is out a hawking and as soon as he cometh home I shall deliver your letter'.

61. For Gaynesford-Hulcote, P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, f. 45r (c. 1481); for Darell-Willoughby-Haute, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 926.

from every region of southern England, who met directly or through their agents over a period of twenty years or more until the matter was concluded in the late 1480s.⁶²

As the gentry met and acted for each other across the regions, and were employed by the crown in instances such as the above, they also met in a political context, serving on commissions which further strengthened their ties with kin and colleagues in, at times, several regions. Sir Thomas St Leger's commissions spanned the South from Kent to Cornwall. Through the 1470s he mixed with Willoughby, Courtenay, Arundel, Berkeley, Uvedale, Fulford, Crocker, Halwell and more in the South West as well as powerful peers from the South East including Sir John Fogge and Thomas Bourghier.⁶³ The West Country's William Hody was active on numerous commissions of inquiry in Devon, Somerset, Dorset and Southampton.⁶⁴ Leading gentry from the Home Counties were included on commissions to survey the River Thames: in 1476, knights William Norris, Richard Fowler, Richard Harcourt, Thomas Delamare and esquires William Stonor, John Harcourt, Richard Croft, John Wood, Thomas Windsor, John Hals, William Danvers, Richard Hall and others co-operated in Middlesex, Surrey, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, and Berkshire.⁶⁵

The discussion has demonstrated the the existence of a vast socio-political network linking the gentry within and across the regions, allowing them to satisfy a variety of concerns among their group, and to join forces in the offices of local and regional administration. While numerous county studies highlight the existence of the 'standard' sorts of social cohesion, southern society attests to a 'regional' dimension in terms of gentry solidarity and activity. The crown recognised and utilised this framework, and while it may be overstating the case to accent an 'inter-regional' aspect of gentry activity, the crown drew on the most powerful knights and esquires in the South to mediate in instances such as Arundel's 'indiscretion', and to co-operate regularly in the offices of regional government.

For the gentry, however, this 'inter-regional' aspect was a reality as demonstrated by the rising of 1483. In fact, while the present discussion has largely explored gentry contacts within their class, in the context of 'Buckingham's rebellion', the network throughout the South which linked the localities, doubtless enabled the rapid dissemination of a variety of information

⁶². C.I.P.M., nos. 30, 181.

⁶³. For St Leger's commissions of oyer and terminer in Kent and Surrey, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 112; for commissions in Hampshire *ibid.*, p. 263; for others in the West, *ibid.*, pp. 108, 183, 408, 491-2.

⁶⁴. For Wiltshire, C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 427; for Devon-Somerset, *ibid.*, pp. 464, 489; for Somerset-Dorset, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 109.

⁶⁵. *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 148, for commissions in 1476 and 1478.

within and across the regions of revolt and into the heart of the movement. In this context it may now be instructive to focus on the connections of the gentry through association with the greater aristocracy, and at court.

2. The Wider World: Contact with Court, Southern Society

The sorts of connections that linked the gentry families across the South of England also linked some of the leading families to the nobility. While most of the gentry married within their class, some selected brides from the lesser and at times the greater nobility. These were the men whose riches rivalled the barons and whose interests spanned several regions. A number such as Berkeley, Daubenay and Arundel from the West Country, or Stonor and Norris from the Central South have been identified. Yet this trend is best demonstrated by the Wingfields of Suffolk. Sir John Wingfield, son of Sir John (d. 1481) was the son-in-law of John Tuchet, Lord Audley; his maternal great-grandmother was the daughter of Richard, earl of Arundel and widow of Thomas Mowbray, duke of Norfolk. His maternal grandmother was the daughter of John Montacute, earl of Salisbury. Sir John's maternal aunt had married Thomas, Lord Stanley (d. 1459), making the Wingfield brothers first cousins of Thomas, Lord Stanley and first earl of Derby.⁶⁶ Wingfield's first cousin, Mary Fitzlewis was the second wife of Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers (executed by Richard III in 1483). In addition, Sir John was linked with Lords Bergavenny and Scrope of Bolton. Scrope had lands in Norfolk and Suffolk through his wife, Anne Wingfield; this match also linked the Wingfields with Scrope's cousins, the Scropes of Upsale and also with Lord Zouch.⁶⁷

The close ties between the gentry and the nobility - particularly in the South West and East Anglia can be measured by the weight of their reciprocal transactions. West Country knight John Willoughby, 'my cousin Cheyney, Biconell and other' were Sir Humphrey Stafford's executors (briefly earl of Devon in 1469), and as such were also associated with Lord Clinton.⁶⁸ Sir William Berkeley's mother had married Lord Powis with whom he acted, while his sister had married William Lord Stourton, overseer of Berkeley's will.⁶⁹ Berkeley himself had acted for associate John Walker, a wealthy merchant of Southampton with his distant kinsman the earl of Arundel and with Richard, duke of Gloucester in 1479. Sir Thomas Arundel

⁶⁶. Wingfield, *op.cit.*, pp. 248,251; *Memorials*, nos. 287, 290.

⁶⁷. For Arundel and Lord Bergavenny, *V.C.H.*, Sussex; for Scrope and Zouch, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 211v-212r, and P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 87v-r; in general see Wingfield, *op.cit.*

⁶⁸. P.R.O., Prob. 11/5, f. 241v; *Somerset Medieval Wills 1383-1500*, ed. F.W.Weaver (London, 1901), p. 196.

⁶⁹. P.R.O., Prob. 11/6, f. 106r; see also P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, f. 191v; for Berkeley-Arundel-Gloucester, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 167.

chose as his feoffees his wife's mother and his brother-in-law, Dame Jane and John, Lord Dinham; Sir Thomas St Leger and John Trevelyan were trustees with Dinham and other notables including the bishops of Lincoln and Coventry as well as Bishop John Morton in 1478. Sir Thomas Melbourne appointed the earl of Arundel as his executor, who also had 'the guiding of...[his] son Henry'; William Case had associated with Fulk Bourghier, Lord Fitzwarren, and remembered his wife in his will;⁷⁰ Dame Anne, Lady Audley, widow of John and mother of James, Lord Audley, had taken as her second husband, the wealthy John Rogers, while the daughter of John Bonville esquire of Shute, Devon, had married Reginald West, Lord Lawarre. Lady Lawarre acted with Sir Walter Hungerford, the 'wellbeloved nephew' of Sir Nicholas Strelley.⁷¹ John Cheyney, Hody and Biconell were trustees for James, earl of Wiltshire, along with the earl of Ormond, and were retained as such by his widow.⁷²

In the South East the gentry and nobility were also entwined: Dame Jane Neville (née Bourghier) chose as her executors her brothers, John Bourghier, Lord Berners and Thomas Bourghier esquire; while her husband Sir George Neville, Lord Bergavenny bequeathed to his daughter Elizabeth Berkeley, 'plate to the value of £20', and chose William Frost as an executor. John Dudley esquire left 'his especial good Lord of Arundel, a cape to the value of £5', while in Sussex William Cheyney received a gift from Jane Fiennes, Lady Dacre. Sir Thomas Tyrell selected as his overseers his 'singular good lord the earl of Essex', Sir Thomas Montgomery and Richard Haute, with Sir Thomas Urswick his executor.⁷³

70. For Arundel, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 235r-236v. Arundel's father's first wife was the daughter of Lord Morley. Arundel was also distantly connected with John, duke of Suffolk, the duke's great-aunt having married John Arundel of Bidford, Devon, Thomas's great-uncle. This kinsman was a brother-in-law of Thomas Chaucer, who, in turn, was a cousin of Bishop Henry Beaufort and Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter. It is not proposed to discuss the political ramifications of the connection here. Clearly, however, Chaucer and Arundel were close earlier in the century, and on Chaucer's death he was found to have held lands with his wife, the 'gift' of John Arundel; see C.C.R., 1429-35, p. 336; for Trevelyan-St Leger-Dinham, C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 389; for Melbourne, P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, f. 178v; for Case, P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, f. 194r: 'to my lady Fitzwaryn my...lute'.

71. This could be the John Rogers who was in the service of prominent knight, William Harcourt, son of Sir Richard; for Audley, P.R.O. Prob. 11/11, f. 189v; for Harcourt, P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, f. 65v; see also P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f. 255r.

72. *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, C 1145.

73. For Dame Jane Neville, P.R.O., Prob. 11/5, f. 256r (1470); for Bergavenny, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 67r; for Dudley, P.R.O., Prob. 11/12, f. 169; for Cheyney, P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, fos. 184v-r (1485); for Tyrell, P.R.O., Prob. 11/6, f. 238r.

In East Anglia, as elsewhere, many had served the leading nobles in various capacities: Ralph Tykhill, retained by the earl of Oxford was an executor for Lady Anne de Vere, for which he received a cup and other rewards.⁷⁴ Robert Ratcliffe esquire chose as his supervisor his 'good lord, John earl of Oxford' to whom he bequeathed his 'ambling horse and a brace of greyhounds'; James Albaster and John Tyrell (Sir Thomas's cousin) had served the earls of Oxford and Essex, respectively.⁷⁵ Sir Henry Wingfield chose as his supervisors 'my lord of Oxford and my lord of Suffolk...' with £20 each.⁷⁶ Sir Thomas Lovell, Oxford's 'old friend', and executor received 'a salt of silver and gilt with a pearl on the top'. Both Sir Thomas Tyrell and Sir William Wentworth had accepted the counsel of the earl of Oxford, while Margaret Beaufort acted as the latter's overseer; Thomas Brewes and William Knyvet were trustees for John, duke of Suffolk's Essex and Suffolk estates in 1481, witnessed by Suffolk's kinsmen, John and Robert Wingfield.⁷⁷ Brewes was also connected with the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Oxford, and through his wife was a kinsman of the Scropes of Bolton. In fact the close relationship between the gentry and nobility in East Anglia is evident in the will of Anne, Lady Scrope whose bequests include her 'sister Radcliffe...my lord of Suffolk, my lady of Oxford...my lord of Surrey...my lord of Howard...' as well as leading gentry: William Overey, William Knyvet, John Paston, Henry Heydon, Thomas Brewes and Robert Wingfield, the latter, Scrope's executor, whom she had 'brought up as a child since he was three years of age'. Lady Scrope mentions her nieces Katherine Brewes and Anne Wingfield, her god-daughter Anne Knyvet and her cousin Elizabeth Lovell, the sister of leading lawyer, Thomas Lovell originally of Barton Bendish, Norfolk.⁷⁸

74. P.R.O., Prob. 11/6, f. 40v.

75. For Radcliffe, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f. 178r; for Albaster and Tirell, P.R.O., Prob 11/9, f. 124r.

76. P.R.O., Prob 11/10, f. 78.

77. *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 2, A 3355; Sir Thomas Tyrell stipulated that the advowson of Ravenshall should remain with the abbess of Brewsyard, 'by the counsel of my lord of Oxford'; for Lovell-Oxford, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11 f. 86; for Tyrell, P.R.O., Prob. 11/17, f. 164r; for Wentworth P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 158v-159v.

78. For Brewes's connection with the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Oxford, see *Paston Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 456A; P.R.O., Prob. 11/11. fos. 213v-214r. See also the will of John, Lord Scrope of Bolton for his own ties with the earls of Surrey and Oxford, and with Robert Wingfield, his trustee: P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 211r. In the Central South, knights William Stonor and Richard Harcourt witnessed a transaction between William Staveley esquire and Francis, Lord Lovell for lands in Buckinghamshire, and with Sir William Norris, they acted with and on behalf of John, duke of Suffolk for his Oxfordshire and Berkshire lands: C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 945 (1482).

Activity between gentry and nobility across the regions was not uncommon and again highlights the links between the classes. It also reinforces the diversity of interests, and the wealth, power and status of the gentry. In East Anglia the Brandons were connected with the Lincolnshire Wests, Lords Lawarre (with estates in the region and in the South West) and the Fulfords through sisters Elizabeth, Florence and Anne Bonville, a connection which opened up the West for the Brandons and their kin.⁷⁹ The Zouches, (kinsmen of the Scropes, in turn related to the Wingfields) were connected with the West Country Dinhams, through Lord Zouche's marriage with Jane, daughter of John, Lord Dinham (another daughter had married Lord Fitzwarren) and with prominent West country gentry such as Charles Dinham esquire and Robert Willoughby.⁸⁰ John Lord Zouche utilised his contacts here as well as in the Central South choosing Thomas Norris as a witness to his appointment of William Catesby as steward of his southern-central and midland estates.⁸¹ The South East gentry also had distinguished contacts in the West: John Pympe and John Darell were trustees for Sir Humphrey Stafford's Kentish lands at his death in 1469; in March 1483, Thomas Darcy esquire of Kent chose Lord Dinham as his overseer, along with Richard Haute; Sir Thomas Bourghier acted with Lords Dinham and Hastings as a trustee for the earl of Essex's Suffolk lands, while London's Sir John Brown, brother of Sir George selected Lord Audley, based in Dorset, as a trustee.⁸² Sir Richard Harcourt, Sir Thomas Stonor and other wealthy knights acted for the latter's great-uncle, John, duke of Suffolk in that county.⁸³

-
79. See, for example, the will of Dame Katherine Bonville, whose bequests include a ring with a ruby to her 'daughter' Elizabeth West, and an ewer of silver to her 'daughter' Florence Fulford; Anne Brandon received £10: P.R.O., Prob. 11/11 fos. 162v-163v.
80. One of Anne's sisters had married Lord Fitzwarren, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 87v. Willoughby was connected with the Zouches of Harringworth: his great-grandfather had married the daughter of Lord Zouche of Harringworth, and his second son was the ancestor of Sir Robert Willoughby, see Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol.2, p. 469.
81. *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 4, A 9659 (June, 1482).
82. For Darcy, P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, f. 183r; for Bourghier, *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 6, C 6184 (1479); for Brown, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f. 264v (1489). Haute had married Elizabeth Darcy, widow of Sir Thomas and it is likely that Thomas Darcy esquire was either a brother or cousin of the knight: *Memorials*, no. 351.
83. The Suffolk connection with the Stonors, Harcourts and Norrises can be traced back to the 1430s when Thomas Stonor acted for William, first duke of Suffolk (d. 1450). In the 1470s his son, John, cultivated his father's contacts and both Stonor (probably the first duke's godson) and Harcourt acted with the duke in property transactions; the political connections between these men will be explored in section 3; see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxvi; J.A.F., Thomson, 'John de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk', *Speculum*, 54 (1979), p. 539. For Norris, C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 749.

The gentry also acted with and for non-resident nobles in southern England. Lengthy absences of northern peers from their southern estates created for the gentry a steady flow of business from East Anglia through to the West Country. Leading knights and esquires (as noted) served absentee landlords as stewards and receivers, and clearly handled much of their business in the South. Indeed it was through these business dealings that the most powerful southern gentry were often drawn together to act in land transactions for, and at times with wealthy aristocrats.

In the Central South, knights William Norris, William Stonor, Edmund Rede, Edmund Hampden and Thomas Urswick along with the Harcourt brothers were associated with some of the most powerful nobles in England.⁸⁴ In the 1460s Richard Harcourt acted with the earl of Shrewsbury, while Norris was a feoffee with Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, his brother the archbishop of York, Reginald Bray and others - and in 1481, including replacements for the deceased, with George, Lord Strange, Edward Stanley esquire, William Hody and more.⁸⁵ Stonor acted with Strange's father, Thomas, Lord Stanley, Reginald Grey, Lord Wilton and others in early 1483; Norris, with Sir Thomas Delamare had been a trustee for Margaret Beaufort's second husband, Sir Henry Stafford, son of Humphrey, first duke of Buckingham, with Thomas Rotherham, archbishop of Canterbury, the earls of Essex and Pembroke, Lord Berners and others, for lands in Berkshire; Beaufort, in turn, was Delamare's overseer while Norris with Hody and Reginald Bray acted often for Lady Margaret, then Lord Stanley's wife, in matters concerning her Berkshire, Cambridgeshire and West Country estates. Bray also acted for John, Lord Dudley; Robert Willoughby had close connections with Walter Blount, Lord Mountjoy, who, in turn, was associated with Elizabeth Woodville, Lord Dinham and Lady de

⁸⁴. Again, by the later fifteenth century these connections were of decades standing. In the 1440s John Norris, Thomas Stonor and Edmund Hampden were trustees with the first duke of Buckingham, with Sir Robert Harcourt (d. 1470) and his brother, Sir Richard (d. 1486?). These men had acted with Lords Stanley, Bergavenny, Dudley, Rivers and other notables from the 1440s; see *C.C.R.*, 1447-54, p. 51 and R. A. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority 1422-1461* (London, 1981) pp. 70-1.

⁸⁵. For Norris-Warwick connection, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, nos. 749, 979; for Harcourt, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 400; Sir Richard had in fact been granted the stewardship of the earl of Shrewsbury's Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Wiltshire lands, which he retained after the earl's death, during the minority of his son and heir, George; see also *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 749.

Vere; Edward Berkeley esquire was an executor of John Blount, Lord Mountjoy and Sir Thomas Urswick was a trustee for Henry, earl of Northumberland's Cambridgeshire lands.⁸⁶

The gentry also acted with and for prominent courtiers and leading ecclesiastics as executors and overseers of wills and as associates in land transactions: In 1472 Sir Robert Wingfield, Sir Maurice Berkeley of Beverstone, his brother, Edward and others were trustees in Norfolk with the earl of Arundel and Anthony, Earl Rivers.⁸⁷ Five years later Hody, Daubenay, Sir Nicholas Latimer, John Cheyney and others acted with the marquis of Dorset, Lords Audley, Hastings and Howard for Robert and Joan Palmer and John, Lord Dinham.⁸⁸ In 1478 knights George Brown and William Stonor were trustees with Lord Hastings; and early in 1483, Hastings, John Morton, bishop of Ely and John Biconell were selected as executors for Richard Pigot.⁸⁹ Sir Roger Tocotes and John Cheyney, along with Richard Beauchamp, Lord St Amand were executors for Richard Beauchamp, bishop of Salisbury.⁹⁰ In his will Robert Morton remembered his 'singular good brother-in-law' John Forster along with his 'good lord' John Morton and his 'good master', Robert Morton.⁹¹ Forster, in turn, appointed John Morton as his overseer.⁹² Others who had close contact with Morton as bishop of Ely and archbishop of Canterbury include James Brown, from Maidstone, Kent, his brother, Sir John Brown of London, John Beele of Surrey, Sir Hugh Brice of London, and William Paston of Norfolk.⁹³

In the 1470s, Haute and Fogge, Richard Guildford, William Scott, John Wingfield, Alexander and Richard Lewkenor were trustees with Henry, duke of Buckingham, the earls of Arundel, Northumberland, Kent and Rivers, for lands in Kent and Surrey.⁹⁴ Haute was a trustee again with Arundel for Lord Clinton's Warwickshire lands and with the marquis of Dorset, for

86. For Stonor-Stanley, *ibid.*, no. 989; for Norris-Stafford, *ibid.*, no. 979; for Urswick-Northumberland, *C.I.P.M.*, no. 558. The Berkshire lands may have been the estates in Old Windsor and New Windsor which came to Lord Stanley in right of his wife.

87. *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 118.

88. For Hody-Daubenay-Latimer *et.al.* with Dorset, Audley and others: *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 748.

89. *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 311, for Brown-Stonor-Hastings; *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/10, f. 102v, 15 April, 1483.

90. *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/7, f. 31r (1481).

91. *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/8, fos. 149r-150v.

92. *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/12, f. 158v.

93. For Brown, *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/8, f. 112v; for Sir John Brown, *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/11, fos. 148v-149v; John Beele, *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/8, f. 156v; Sir Hugh Brice, *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/11, fos. 17r-19r; William Paston, *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/11, f. 102v.

94. *C.I.P.M.*, no. 681; for Wingfield-Buckingham in 1476, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 42.

Margaret Beaufort's Cambridgeshire estates;⁹⁵ he was also an executor for Rivers in 1483, along with Buckingham, Sir John Guildford, William Hussy, chief justice of the king's bench, and Robert Poyntz from the West.⁹⁶ In turn, Fogge was a trustee for Haute, his kinsman, with their own kin by marriage, Dorset and Rivers, along with Sir Henry Ferrers, John Melbourne, Nicholas Gaynesford and others.⁹⁷ Sir John Guildford had conducted land transactions in Kent with both the earl of Warwick and with William, Lord Hastings.⁹⁸ Sir Richard Darell, Buckingham's step-father acted with and for the duke in the South West, while his brother George had enfeoffed Thomas Bourghier, archbishop of Canterbury, West Country knight John Willoughby, Haute and others for lands in the South East.⁹⁹ Sir Thomas St Leger was busy with Hastings and Buckingham as trustees for Elizabeth Uvedale, while Sir George Brown was also a trustee in Surrey with Dorset, Rivers, Lord Hastings, Nicholas Gaynesford, Morgan Kidwelly and more, for Margery Marshall.¹⁰⁰

Clearly ties between leading gentry and prominent courtiers were close through the 1470s. Further, the sorts of connections many enjoyed at court is evident from testimonies by knights Richard Croft, Richard Edgecombe, Sir William Knyvet, William Tyler and others in 1486 (along with the earl of Derby and William earl of Nottingham) regarding the consanguinity of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. Tyler had known Queen Elizabeth for twelve years, Edgecombe, sixteen, and Knyvett, from birth. Tyler had known Henry VII 'well' for twenty years, Knyvet for fifteen, while Edgecombe's first meeting had obviously occurred in Brittany in 1483.¹⁰¹

While the aristocracy mingled throughout the South, yet again friction was part of the fabric of life and there are instances of disputes involving gentry and nobles, often at variance over matters relating to their estates. In the early 1480s the Queen chastised Sir William Stonor for trespassing within the forest and chase of Barnwood, and for deer hunting out of season he incurred 'our great...displeasure'. Yet this infringement did not harm his standing at

95. C.I.P.M., nos. 331, 704.

96. P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f.319r (23 June, 1483); see also C.I.P.M., no. 681.

97. C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1370; *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 3, A 5360.

98. P.R.O., Prob. 11/9, f. 223v.

99. *Extant Documents*, p. 332; C.I.P.M., no. 926.

100. C.I.P.M., no. 392; C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 719, (1480).

101. *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Register relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. XIV, 1484-1492, ed. J.A. Twemlow (1960), pp. 14-29.

court and he remained Queen Elizabeth's 'trusty and well-beloved' knight.¹⁰² In April 1481 Sir William was at variance with Richard, duke of Gloucester necessitating a bond for himself and guarantors including John Harcourt and Sir William Norris. Stonor was urged to the capital by his business associate and cousin Walter Elmes, to meet the demands of the new recognisance. Elmes also advised Stonor that 'if you have any certainty of your men...come show it, for my lord of Gloucester and my lord chamberlain be gone, and now be here your friends'. Whatever the nature of the dispute and despite his associate's warning, Stonor continued to prosper at court and in his region during the early 1480s, and under Gloucester both as Protector and King. These examples illustrate the strength of ties between leading gentry and the crown (or, the way in which their relations could withstand friction).¹⁰³ Yet others were less fortunate. Katherine Bonville widow of John Bonville of Shute, Devon, mentions 'being in trouble and variance' with the Queen's son, Dorset, over the issues and profits of all her Devon and Somerset lands. With resignation Bonville informed her executors that 'if the said lands cannot be recovered...then I will that my executors shall perform and fulfill my husband's will'.¹⁰⁴ Some, close to death, were at pains to smooth out their differences such as Oxfordshire esquire John Denton, kinsman of Brown. 'And where', he says, 'there resteth in divers men's minds that I should be of untrue demeanour against my lord of Buckingham...if that be of truth...I beseech God my soul be punished in hell'.¹⁰⁵

That many were on familiar, even intimate terms with leading aristocrats is most evident however, from snippets of information which help 'round out' the bare facts of business activities. In 1481, Exeter merchant Richard Germyn wanting satisfaction in a business matter urged Sir William Stonor's action as he 'be the greatest man with my lord [Dorset]'.¹⁰⁶ Stonor was also one of 'the greatest men' with his kinsman Francis, Lord Lovell whose part he took in a dispute over the latter's Oxfordshire lands obtained from Richard, duke of York.¹⁰⁷ Some

102. *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, nos. 313, 319. The Queen was already well-aware of Stonor's numerous suits for trespass as *ibid.*, no. 313 indicates. However in 1481 'our trusty and well-beloved Sir William' apparently received a doe from Elizabeth Woodville: *Wedgwood*, p. 815.

103. For Stonor-Gloucester dispute, *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, nos. 287, 288. Estates may well have been at the heart of this conflict. Stonor had married Anne Neville, daughter of John Marquis of Montagu, brother of the deceased earl of Warwick and a cousin of Gloucester, whose ward she most likely was: *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxiii.

104. *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, nos. 157, 158; for Bonville/Dorset, P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 163v.

105. P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 139v (1493).

106. *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 285. Stonor's mother, Jane also had influence with the Queen and her brother, Lionel Woodville, see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 320.

107. C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 284 (1477).

died indebted to their colleagues such as Anthony, Earl Rivers who appealed to Sir John Guildford to satisfy his debts including 200 marks to Sir Thomas Vaughan;¹⁰⁸ or Robert Willoughby esquire who died owing money to Elizabeth Woodville, John, Lord Dinham and Lady de Vere.¹⁰⁹ Others died without reimbursement, such as Sir Henry Wentworth, still expecting the fifty marks from Sir James Tyrell 'according to the award made by...[his] lord of Oxford';¹¹⁰ or Sir Richard Rose who at his death in 1481 was owed £6 'due unto [him]... by the earl of Huntingdon'.¹¹¹ For many closest to the nobility bequests of valuable animals, furniture, china, books or clothes are indicative of warm friendships. John Tyrell bequeathed to his 'lord of Essex', his best horse.¹¹² John and Sir Robert Willoughby acquired a bed adorned with Buckingham arms in silver from their cousin, Robert, Lord Willoughby.¹¹³ Thomas Heton esquire of Bedford left his servant Anne 'a hanging bed of white linen cloth...which [he] was wont to have of [his] lady of Buckingham'.¹¹⁴ Sir Thomas Burgh bequeathed five bowls, purchased from the earl of Northumberland's executors, to, among others, Lord Fitzhugh and his servant, John Brown - business which was overseen by Sir Reginald Bray and Margaret Beaufort. Burgh also left his daughter, lady Fitzhugh, a book belonging to his late wife, enamelled with gold.¹¹⁵ Others left jewelry such as the rings of gold left to Katherine Brewes and Anne Knyvet by Lady Zouche.¹¹⁶ Items of clothing also suggest intimacy such as the gown bequeathed by Cecily duchess of York to Richard and Jane Brocas, along with other items left to valued servants.¹¹⁷

Importantly, through their connections the gentry mixed with those closest to the King - his own and his wife's kin - prominent courtiers and distinguished guests. Many (as noted) were connected with Margaret Beaufort; others with the duchess of York such as Richard Brocas and knights Reginald Bray and Thomas Lovell.¹¹⁸ Lady Agnes Scott and her husband Sir John were on intimate terms with the King's sister and her husband, the duke and duchess of Burgundy. In her will Agnes Scott bequeathed to her 'daughter

108. P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 319v-320v.

109. P.R.O., Prob. 11/6, fos. 130v-r (1472).

110. P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 158r-159v.

111. P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, f. 35v.

112. P.R.O., Prob. 11/5, f. 11.

113. P.R.O., Prob. 11/3, f. 11 (1464).

114. P.R.O., Prob. 11/5, fos. 216v-r.

115. P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, fos. 241r-242r; P.R.O., Prob. 11/10, fos. 241r-242r.

116. P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 213r.

117. P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 213r.

118. *Ibid.*

Bedingfeld...a little gilt standing cup', a present from the duchess, and to Elizabeth Poynings 'a standing cup of gilt with a greyhound in the bottom' a gift to her husband from the duke of Burgundy.¹¹⁹ These were just some of the rewards for keeping company with wealthy and influential friends.

An examination of the power-structure in the South has revealed the regional status and political weight of the most important gentry. Significantly the framework which allowed knights and esquires to satisfy their own concerns and which emphasises the 'regional' dimension of their activity, also applies in the present context; leading gentry co-operated with resident and non-resident nobles at the local and regional level, and also at court. There was yet another level on which they consolidated their power. It is proposed now to broaden the discussion and to explore the ways in which the gentry used their contacts and offered their talents, much in demand in royal and noble households.

3. Service: Provenance and Profit

In addition to the connections and reciprocal service outlined, many of the gentry served in noble and ecclesiastical households, in estate-management or in service as lawyers, administrators and councillors. Their careers took them throughout the South, reinforcing their considerable links within gentry ranks as well as the greater aristocracy. It was, in fact, through their skills as careerists in both a 'private' and a 'public' sense that many made their way first in the private households of the well-connected - and subsequently (often simultaneously) at court.

By the late 1470s, a number of prominent southern gentry had served Henry, duke of Buckingham (as noted) in estate-management: the Poyntzes and Berkeleys, Hodys, Uvedales, Twynyhos, Trevelyans and Arundels in the West Country; in the Central South and South East, the St Legers, Darells, Gaynesfords, Guildfords, Pympes and Cheyneys, Clerks, Stidolfs, Bruyns, Harpers and Harcourts. Many of these men and their kin had served the dukes of Buckingham for decades providing skill and expertise in administrative and legal matters. The first duke's council for example, was composed of Sir William Berkeley's uncle, Thomas Berkeley; John Pympe's father; Sir Robert Willoughby's kinsman, Thomas; Edward Poyntz's uncle, Nicholas, and William Hody's father, John. These families also provided the core of the second duke's council - among them Thomas Cheyney, John Twynyho, William Fissher, John

¹¹⁹. P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, f. 126r.

Pympe junior and Sir Richard Darell, the duke's step-father and senior councillor. Others included Sir William Knyvet and Sir Nicholas Latimer, chamberlains of the household.¹²⁰

A number of these families had also served the first duke's second son, Sir Henry Stafford (Buckingham's uncle): William Hody for example had provided legal service along with John Biconell and both were closely associated with Reginald Bray, Sir Henry's steward and receiver-general. After Stafford's death in 1471 they continued in the service of his widow, Margaret Beaufort, following her marriage to Thomas, Lord Stanley. Yet none were exclusively Stafford or Beaufort annuitants. Hody's uncle, Sir Alexander also a lawyer, had advanced his career in the households of the earls of Shrewsbury and Warwick. Biconell was retained by Sir John and Thomas Arundel¹²¹ and both he and Hody as esteemed lawyers, along with Bray, were much in demand as warrantors in quitclaims and as trustees, serving the gentry and nobility from Cornwall to Cambridgeshire, Sussex through to Berkshire.¹²² Other leading lawyers in the West, Richard and Robert Morton, served their kinsmen John and Robert Morton, bishop of Ely and keeper of the rolls, respectively, in a professional capacity, forging alliances and business connections with esteemed knights and nobles. Most likely Sir William Hussey provided legal, certainly administrative service to John Lord Audley, and with Bray, to John, Lord Dudley,¹²³ while the earl of Arundel made use of the administrative skills of Sir Thomas Melbourne and his uncle, lawyer Michael Skilling.¹²⁴ So too, Sir Giles Daubenay's legal training also fostered prime appointments for him in the service of his kinsmen Sir William Berkeley, Thomas Arundel and Lord Stourton.¹²⁵

120. Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 108; see also Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, p. 33, and Appendices, *passim*; for Darell, *Extant Documents*, p. 332.

121. For Biconell, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 235r-236v: 'and I will that my said feoffees make a state of annuity of 5 marks yearly over to John Biconell over the fee to him by my father and mother of old time granted...for the good service that he has done to me before this time'.

122. For Beaufort-Hody, C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 339; see also C. H. Cooper, *Memoir of Margaret Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge, 1874), p. 50; C.C.R., 1476-85, nos. 265, 474, 527, 616, 664, 748 749, 829.

123. C.I.P.M., no. 604 for Audley; for service to Lord Dudley, P.R.O., Prob. 11/8, fos. 68r-69v; both Hussey and Bray were to receive 100 marks 'on condition that...[they] get or do to be gotten of the king...£250...which our said king oweth to me'.

124. Melbourne had served the crown in estate-management with the earl of Arundel in Wiltshire in the 1470s.

125. P.R.O., Prob. 11/7, fos. 190v-191r for Berkeley's will, written in 1475, with a codicil added in 1485.

John Cheyney and Sir Robert Willoughby were also closely connected with Margaret Beaufort and Lord Stanley along with Norfolk knight William Brandon all of whom were possibly annuitants, clearly colleagues of John Morton, bishop of Ely. Both Cheyney and Brandon attended Morton at his enthronement as bishop of Ely in August, 1479.¹²⁶ This connection was probably of years standing; one William Brandon had been master of Balliol College when John Morton was an undergraduate at Oxford. Brandon was also a Mowbray retainer from at least the mid-1450s serving the duke of Norfolk as his chief councillor for many years.¹²⁷

Melbourne's kinsman John, another lawyer was associated with prominent East Anglian lawyers including Henry Heydon, Edmund Bedingfield and others, many of whom were retained by the earl of Oxford: James Hobart, William Waldgrave, William Oakley, William and Edward Jenney, Richard Southwell, Richard Pigot, Robert Brewes, Sir John Wingfield, Thomas Lovell and Anthony Danvers, the latter connected with a leading Oxfordshire family which specialised in the law.¹²⁸ Lovell had a powerful patron in Henry Heydon from whom he received an annuity of twenty shillings yearly from 1473, and through whom he was associated with the marquis of Dorset;¹²⁹ he was also linked with the duke of Suffolk, Lords Zouche and Scrope along with Wingfield, Brewes and others, lawyers and kin whose contacts stretched across southern England through to the West Country. Hobart also served Robert Radcliffe, Lord Fitzwalter in Norfolk; Heydon served Lord Scrope, and both men, George Neville, Lord Bergavenny in the South East.¹³⁰

Also in the South East Thomas Oxenbridge was a client of Richard Fiennes, Lord Dacre and was a trustee for Lady Fiennes. Lawyers Sir Thomas Fitzwilliam and Robert Rede were retained by William Lord Berkeley (earl of Nottingham in 1483); while solicitors Nicholas and John Gaynesford acted with the doyens of the legal world: Richard Fowler, John Catesby, Humphrey Starky and John Fineux (Edward IV's attorneys) and were associated in a professional capacity with Dorset and Earl Rivers.¹³¹ Thomas Croft served the latter as 'deputy' while William Stonor was closely tied to Dorset in the 1470s. In 1479 Stonor was

126. See Griffiths and Thomas, *The Making of the Tudor Dynasty*, p. 108.

127. *Extant Documents*, p. 316.

128. *C.I.P.M.*, no. 872; see also *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/7, f. 86.

129. E. W. Ives, 'Andrew Dymmock and the Papers of Antony, Earl Rivers, 1482-3', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XLI (1968), pp. 220-1.

130. *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/11, f. 86v; *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/11, fos. 211v-212r; *P.R.O.*, Prob 11/11, f. 67r.

131. *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/7, f. 182v; for Fitzwilliam and Rede, *P.R.O.*, Prob 11/9, f. 83v; see also *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, nos. 647, 667; for association with Dorset and Rivers, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 1370.

steward of Thame for Thomas Rotherham, bishop of Lincoln, later archbishop of York, and his successor in the former office, John Russell.¹³² That many were clients of a number of powerful patrons is evident from numerous transactions, among them an extant deed from 1481 in which the duke of Buckingham selected Richard Choke, Guy Fairfax, Richard Pigot, John Catesby and Andrew Dymmock (the latter retained by among others Earl Rivers) as trustees for his Warwickshire lands ; among the other trustees - the archbishops of Canterbury and York, John Morton, bishop of Ely, John Russell bishop of Lincoln, the earl of Essex and Lords Hastings, Howard and Ferrers.¹³³

Few of the above could be construed as political appointments. The gentry were retained for their legal or administrative skills, and profited both in terms of cash and contacts. In fact all the above had numerous ties within the aristocracy, and were cultivated by lords only too willing to tap their ability, and to pay for the privilege. Yet the gentry's biggest employer was the crown which retained scores of men (and women) both in the administration of its estates and its households. Many of those involved in estate-administration have been identified. Yet, without retracing too much ground, it might prove instructive to explore - in some detail - the categories of office-holders within the crown's estates and in the coastal towns and the capital. It is clear that the crown selected its officials largely on the basis of a man's landed wealth and local standing in a hierarchy of service ranging from the highest ranking receivers-general down to the bailiffs and reeves; from aristocrats who became titular heads or who received hereditary positions in land organisation, wealthy and talented administrators, often with knowledge of the law and frequently from families which specialised in estate-management, serving as receivers, stewards and auditors - to the lesser gentry for whom an office was more a social coup and a lucrative sideline. It is simplistic, however, to assume that these groups represented distinct categories of wealth within the gentry and there is overlap between the categories as the discussion will demonstrate. In the main, however, it appears that the lesser officials who served as revenue collectors in the ports and on the land were men of moderate means. Higher on the scale the 'careerist administrators' (many of whom have already been mentioned) were often men of considerable wealth and diverse interests who served the crown as receivers, stewards and auditors. Above these (as noted) were the wealthiest landed gentry most of whom were repeatedly chosen as porters, parkers, keepers and constables of crown lands.

132. For Croft, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 548; for Stonor, *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, pp. xxx-xxiii. Stonor's father, Thomas, had been in service to George Neville, archbishop of York from the late 1460s, and Sir William evidently had some connections with his circle: *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 97.

133. *Archaeologia*, 38 (1860), pp. 275-9.

The vast majority of gentry families were moderately wealthy with two or three manors or perhaps more, whose power was localised within their county or adjoining shires and sometimes beyond. These were the men to whom the crown looked for the maintenance of its affairs and the management of its estates at the local level. This group (among them a number of newly wealthy merchants and traders along with younger sons of established families) provided both the minor officials within the royal lordships and hundreds such as the bailiffs and reeves, and also those who held the more prestigious and lucrative office of escheator. From the same group the crown selected officials who served in port administration as controllers, searchers and collectors of the customs and subsidies in the coastal towns.

Some of the gentry wore a number of hats such as Kentishmen William Stapelhill who was both an escheator and supervisor of customs in Dartmouth and Robert Brent who was controller of the great and petty custom in Sandwich, verger and keeper there, and reeve of Middleton, while his kinsman, Roger Brent was King's escheator in Canterbury.¹³⁴ Other port officials in the South East included John White (Surrey), London goldsmith John Barker and Roger Appleton (Kent).¹³⁵ Esquires William Weston, (Surrey and Sussex) William Daubenay, Thomas Audley (Dorset), Christopher Colyns, Thomas Cotton and Richard Danvers (Oxfordshire) were all officials in the port of London.¹³⁶ Roger Kelsale and Thomas Coombes were collectors in Southampton along with Berkshire esquire Thomas Langford, London draper, Thomas Nutson, Morgan Kidwelly and John Warde, merchant of Southampton who served both there and at Poole.¹³⁷ Also at Poole were Richard Mansell, John Danby, Thomas Bradley, Hugh Bramborough, Richard Morton, John Flasby, John Kymer and Raynold Hassall, the last three both royal officials and 'my lord of Buckingham'[s] men'.¹³⁸ Others further west at Plymouth, Exeter and Bristol included esquires Thomas Croft and John Atwell, Thomas

134. For William Stapelhill, P.R.O., C67/51/26; Robert Brent, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 207, P.R.O., C67/51/2 and 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V', p. 227; for Roger Brent, C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 71, 418.

135. For Barker, P.R.O., E 404/77/2/48; for White, P.R.O., C67/51/29; for Appleton, P.R.O., C67/51/26.

136. William Weston, P.R.O., C67/51/21; William Daubenay, P.R.O., E 404/77/3/36; Thomas Audley, C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 867; Christopher Collins, P.R.O., E 404/77/3/29; Thomas Cotton, P.R.O., E 404/77/3/54 and C67/51/9; Richard Danvers, P.R.O., C67/51/18.

137. Roger Kelsale and Thomas Coombes, P.R.O., E 404/77/3/45; Thomas Langford, P.R.O., C67/51/7; Nutson, P.R.O., C67/51/17; Morgan Kidwelly, P.R.O., C67/51/15; John Warde, P.R.O., C67/51/37.

138. For Mansell, A. R. Myers, 'The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, 1466-7', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. L (1957-8), p. 225; for John Danby, P.R.O., C67/51/11; Thomas Bradley, P.R.O., C67/51/37; Hugh Bramborough, P.R.O., C67/51/2; for Morton, Flasby, Kymer and Hassell, 'Financial Memoranda. of the Reign of Edward V', p. 227; P.R.O., C67/51/1.

Grayson, John Heron and John Twynyho, yet another of Buckingham's men.¹³⁹ In charge of proceedings in Devon and Southampton were Richard More and Sir William Berkeley with £20 for his trouble.¹⁴⁰

As with customs officials operating in the ports and towns, the royal bailiffs also collected revenues due to the King both from royal lorships and hundreds and ecclesiastical holdings vacant through death or translation.¹⁴¹ In this capacity Thomas Savesdon of Canterbury collected revenues from the liberty of the bishop of Ely; yeoman of the crown Richard Cruse of Barnstable, Devon, was bailiff of the hundreds of Harigge and Westgate, and the farms of Crane and Sellers in Topsham, Devon, while William Awedon was bailiff of Chelham hundred in Buckinghamshire.¹⁴²

A notch higher the escheators were commissioned by the King to collect revenues for the crown derived from the lands of deceased tenants; they also supervised the wardships, marriages and reliefs which came to the King on the death of his tenants-in-chief. In the early 1460s and 1470s a number of officers were commissioned to deal with the flow of forfeited lands which escheated to the crown. In the far west, William Knoyll of Somerset was escheator for the late duke of Clarence's West Country estates;¹⁴³ others here included Dorset kinsmen Richard and Robert Morton, (the latter, a lawyer as noted, who served both in Dorset and further afield in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire) Anthony Brown esquire from Surrey, Thomas Mancell and further west in Gloucestershire and the march of Wales, Edmund Langley, Robert Croke and Walter Dennis, the latter both of Gloucester and Surrey. The Hampshire contingent included Thomas Unwin, Robert Darell and William Hall; in Oxfordshire and Berkshire, Richard Chamberlain and in the South East, Surrey gentlemen John Belle of Leatherhead, Richard Skinner of Pekham and John Anstey of Canterbury.¹⁴⁴

139. Croft, P.R.O., C67/51/7; Atwell, P.R.O., C67/51/33; Grayson, P.R.O., C67/51/28; Heron, P.R.O., C67/51/8; Twynyho, P.R.O., C67/51/10. See in general M.H. Mills, 'The Collectors of Customs', *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, ed. W. A. Morris and J. R. Strayer (Massachusetts, 1947), pp. 168,179.

140. P.R.O., C67/51/2; P.R.O., E 404/77/2/61.

141. E.R. Stevenson, 'The Escheator', *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, p. 111.

142. For Savesdon, P.R.O., C67/51/21; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 201, 205; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 213; P.R.O., C67/51/20.

143. P.R.O., C67/51/20.

144. Thomas Mancell was also receiver of Elizabeth Woodville's duchy of Lancaster lands in Hampshire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Wiltshire and Dorset, see Myers, *op.cit.*, (Vol. L), pp. 224-5, and P.R.O., C67/51/15; for Anthony Brown, P.R.O., C67/51/14; Langley, P.R.O.,

The second category can be identified as a select group of talented careerists who specialised in estate-management. Unlike the titular heads of duchy lands such as William, Lord Hastings or Earl Rivers, these officers were the work-horses in crown administration. Often trained in the law, generations of families were employed to administer lands which escheated to the crown particularly in the early 1460s and 1470s through forfeiture and wardship. B.P. Wolffe articulates the crown's method of bypassing 'the exchequer farming pool' by placing these vast estates in the hands of receivers, stewards and auditors 'no mere rent collectors', but men 'appointed by the King to posts of the highest initiative and trust'.¹⁴⁵ Edward IV's 'Yorkist land revenue experiment' began in the early 1460s and leading gentry such as the Oxfordshire Harcourts, Crofts and Fowlers were among the first to benefit. John Harcourt of Staffordshire and Oxfordshire was receiver of Clarence's forfeited Warwick and Spenser lands in Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Oxfordshire, Wiltshire and Berkshire.¹⁴⁶ Sir Richard Croft became receiver-general of the earldom of March, steward of Kirtlington and keeper of Woodstock in Oxfordshire, while his brother, Richard was appointed receiver of the Herefordshire lands of the earl of Shrewsbury during his minority.¹⁴⁷ Richard Fowler became receiver of the earl of Shrewsbury's lands in Derbyshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Cheshire, Gloucestershire, Buckinghamshire, Wiltshire and elsewhere, and obtained the stewardship of lands forfeited by the earls of Wiltshire and Devon.¹⁴⁸ Others in this category include John Forster, receiver-general of Elizabeth Woodville's lands, Nicholas Gaynesford, receiver of the Queen's duchy lands in Essex, Hertfordshire, London and Surrey, John Hayes, William Clifford, John Walsh, William Harper, William Brent and Thomas Stidolf.¹⁴⁹ Auditors Robert Coorte, John Hewyk, John

C67/51/18; Croke, P.R.O., C67/51/16; Dennis, P.R.O., 67/61/33; Unwin, P.R.O., C67/51/25; Robert Darell, C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 515; Chamberlain, P.R.O., C67/51/13; Belle, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 144, 175; Richard Skinner, P.R.O., C67/51/2; Anstey, P.R.O., C67/51/33.

145. B. P. Wolffe, 'The Management of English Royal Estates under Yorkist Kings', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CCLXXVIII (1956), pp. 6-9' Wolffe, *The Royal Demesne in English History*, pp. 160-61.
146. Wolffe, 'The Management of English Royal Estates under Yorkist Kings', p. 3.
147. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 105.
148. C.P.R., 1461-7, pp. 40, 118.
149. John Forster was also controller of the tunnage and poundage in London from 1467, see C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 515 and Myers, *op.cit.*, (Vol. L), p. 216. For Gaynesford, Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 608; Hayes and Clifford: Wolffe, *The Royal Demesne in English History*, Appendix D, p. 294; Walsh, P.R.O., C67/51/7 and Wolffe, *ibid.*, p. 295; Harper, P.R.O., C67/51/8; Brent, Wolffe, *ibid.*, p. 292; Stidolf, Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, p. 212. Many of these men were also associated with the premier nobles by whom they were retained, see above,

Clerk, John Knight and the Harpers: John, father and son, and kinsmen Richard and Thomas were associated with the above through their service to the crown.

Some of these officials such as the Crofts, Fowlers and Harcourts had sufficient estates and regional power to be included in the first category - the wealthiest landed gentry; aristocrats who repeatedly obtained the choice royal pickings within their regions of influence as parkers, porters, keepers and constables of crown lands. Not receivers or stewards of vast estates like the above, nor, for the most part employed as officials in the ports, these men had great wealth which rivalled the minor barons with whom they served, their offices commensurate with their wealth and standing. Most, from established gentry families, some, newly wealthy, belonged to an elite, an aristocracy of wealth, bred and schooled in a tradition of service within the shires and beyond; men who had proved their worth over many years - among them, a number on intimate terms with Edward IV. In fact their wealth, status and skills ensured that their power - localised *and* bridging the regions - was also felt at court. It is on their designations and offices within the royal households, that the the discussion will now focus.

At the time of Edward IV's death on 9 April, 1483 all the sample gentry or close kin had occupied powerful positions at court.¹⁵⁰ From the West Country Sir Thomas St Leger, the King's brother-in-law, was an esquire of the body by 1475; several years on he became a knight of the body, controller of the mint and master of the hart hounds.¹⁵¹ Robert Willoughby was knighted in 1478 while Thomas Arundel, Edward Courtenay and John Halwell were king's servants with weighty connections at court; by 1483 the latter was very much a part of the King's

Chapter 3, pp. 19-20, 28-32; in addition Knight was a client of the dukes of Norfolk and Buckingham, the earl of Nottingham and lords Stanley, Strange, Fitzwarren and Dacre; Richard Harper retained as well by Buckingham, also served Thomas, Lord Stanley; Harcourt was receiver of a number of the duchess of Buckingham's lands from 1465 while Stidolf and Walsh were receivers of Buckingham's Kent and Surrey estates; for Knight, see P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, f. 11r; for Harper, *Wedgwood*, p. 429.

¹⁵⁰. As C. Ross says, below the great offices of the household were the offices of the king's knights and esquires, the esquires of the body and the king's carvers and sewers. These were the men who attended the King. They were 'by the advice of his council to be chosen men of their possession [i.e. men of means], worship, wisdom; also to be of sundry shires, by whom it may be known the disposition of the counties'. These men were the power-brokers in the South, the link between court and county, serving at once Edward IV 'and their own local interests'. This point will be fully developed in Parts 3 and 4; see Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), pp. 326-7. See also Morgan, 'The house of policy', pp. 24-70, *passim*.

¹⁵¹. For St Leger, see B.L. Stowe Ms, f. 440; C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 107.

household.¹⁵² Richard Nanfan (an esquire of the body by 1485) was no stranger to Westminster, his father John, also an esquire of the body, having been chamberlain of the exchequer from 1445-6.¹⁵³ Likewise John Treffry's father had been prominent at court in the 1440s and 1450s, and Treffry himself became a groom under Edward, and by 1483 an esquire of the body, along with Thomas Audley, gentleman usher to Edward IV. Escaping attainder in the West, Thomas Fulford and John Crocker were knights.¹⁵⁴ East Anglia's Thomas Brandon (who rebelled in the West) was the son of Sir William (prominent at court) and the brother of William the younger esquire; John Cheverell esquire, was a 'king's servant' by 1478; Piers, father of Richard Edgecombe esquire, had been a member of Henry VI's household; William Twynyho was 'king's esquire' by 1481, while Richard and Robert Morton were 'king's servants'.¹⁵⁵

Among the Salisbury contingent, Giles Daubenay was an esquire of the body by 1477 and a knight of the body by 1480;¹⁵⁶ Nicholas Latimer and John St Lo were knights by 1471;¹⁵⁷ Walter Hungerford, cousin of the King, was an esquire of the body in 1482, while John Cheyney, an esquire of the body by 1471, was master of the henchmen by 1478 and master of the horse from 1479;¹⁵⁸ John Trenchard esquire, Humphrey Cheyney, gentleman and John Heron, an attorney, all had prominent kinsmen and ties with court.

From the Newbury sector, William Berkeley, son of Sir Maurice, a knight of the body to Edward, was himself an esquire of the body by 1474;¹⁵⁹ Thomas Delamare was knighted between 1473-5 and his relation was probably the unnamed esquire of the household at Edward

-
152. For Willoughby, *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 491; Arundel, Courtenay and Halwell, *ibid.*, no. 224; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 521; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. xxiii-xxiv; *Wedgwood*, p. 406; for Courtenay see in general Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XIV (1972), pp. 230-246, especially p. 235.
153. For Nanfan, *Wedgwood*, p. 621.
154. For Treffry, Horrox, *op.cit.*, p. 242; for Audley, *Index of Manuscripts in the British Library*, Lansdowne Ms, Vol. 1, p. 198, and *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 299.
155. For Cheverell, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 69; for Richard Edgecombe, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 110; for Piers Edgecombe, Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 445; for William Twynyho, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 278.
156. For Daubenay, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 177.
157. For Latimer and St Lo, *B.L.*, Add Ms 6113, f. 19.
158. For Hungerford, *Wedgwood*, p. 486; for Cheyney, *P.R.O.*, E 404/77/2/32 and *P.R.O.*, E 404/77/3/65; see also *Extant Documents*, p. 321.
159. For Berkeley, *P.R.O.*, E 404/77/2/61.

IV's funeral.¹⁶⁰ William Norris called 'king's knight' in 1469, was a knight of the body by 1474; described by A. R. Myers as one of the knights of the chamber, his wife Joanna was one of the Queen's ladies-in-waiting.¹⁶¹ William Stonor, made a knight of the bath in 1478, became a knight of the body soon after, while William Overey and Roger Tocotes were both knights and members of the King's household.¹⁶² By 1482 John Norris and William Uvedale were esquires of the body, while Uvedale's wife, Elizabeth was the Queen's lady-in-waiting.¹⁶³ Finally, John Harcourt esquire was a gentleman usher of the chamber by 1478 and Edward IV's 'trusted servant', while gentleman Edmund Hampden as the second son of Thomas Hampden of Hampden and cousin of Sir William Stonor, was also a member of the household with some powerful backing behind him.¹⁶⁴

Sir William Knyvet had been knighted in 1475, while from the South East Sir George Brown, knighted after Tewkesbury in 1471, became a knight of the body and clerk of the hanaper in 1479 when the Paston family 'sought his good offices as one of those...' which wait most upon the King and lie nightly in his chamber...' ¹⁶⁵ Kin by marriage of the Woodvilles, Sir John Fogge was well-placed as Edward IV's treasurer of the household, keeper of the wardrobe and King's councillor. Formerly king's esquire, he was knighted in June 1461. From February 1473 with Sir John Scott and Sir Richard Haute he was a tutor and councillor to Edward, Prince of Wales. His wife Alice Haute, was also in the Queen's household.¹⁶⁶ Sir John Guildford, knighted in April 1467, was controller of the household and privy councillor to Edward IV.¹⁶⁷ Nicholas Gaynesford was an esquire of the body, by April 1461, king's servitor

160. For Delamare, *Archaeologia*, Vol. I, p. 353. The King owed Delamare £84 in 1465 for horses, saddles and shields for tournaments, see Myers, *op.cit.*, (Vol. LI), p. 443.

161. Norris, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 488; he is described by A. R. Myers as one of the knights of the chamber: A. R. Myers, *The Household of Edward IV* (Manchester, 1959), p. 41; see also B.L. Stowe Ms 440, f. 75v.

162. For Overey, *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 246; for Stonor, *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxx; for Tocotes, *Wedgwood*, p. 859 who says the latter 'was considered to be part of the household when granted licence to marry Lady St Amand, in April, 1458'.

163. William Uvedale, *Archaeologia*, Vol. 1, p. 352; John Norris, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 145.

164. For Harcourt, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 103.

165. See Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 105-6; *Paston Letters*, Vol. I, no. 383.

166. Myers, 'The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville', (Vol. LI), p. 451; *Wedgwood*, p. 399; *Memorials*, no. 141.

167. *Wedgwood*, pp. 402-3.

and usher of the chamber to Edward IV, then to Elizabeth Woodville for whom his wife acted as a lady-in-waiting.¹⁶⁸

Thomas Fiennes was an esquire of the body by 1480 and was also connected with the Queen's household.¹⁶⁹ Richard Haute esquire, son of Sir Richard (d. 1483) was associated with the household of the duke of York. A kinsman of the Queen, his father, uncle and cousins were members of the household of either the Prince of Wales or the Queen. Haute's wife, Elizabeth Darcy, was the 'lady mistress of the King's nursery' in January, 1481 when she was granted a tun of wine yearly, 'for her good service to the King and his consort and his son the prince'.¹⁷⁰ Esquires Edward Poynings and William Brandon had powerful kinsmen in the royal household: Sir George Brown and Sir William Brandon, step-father and father respectively. The latter in fact was marshal of the king's bench from 1457-1491, servant of the household in January 1460, king's servitor in January 1462 and was knighted in 1471.¹⁷¹ Sir Thomas Bourghier, the King's cousin, referred to as 'king's kinsman' in January 1464, was sewer to the King in 1461, marshal of the marshalsea in 1464 and a knight of the body in 1478. Sir William Haute was king's servitor in 1461; John Wingfield was an esquire of the body to Edward IV, while his colleagues Thomas Lewkenor, John Gaynesford and Richard Guildford were all esquires by early 1483, with, like Wingfield, powerful contacts at court.¹⁷²

These men - powers in the county as well as at court - provided the substance of 'Buckingham's rebellion' in October, 1483. Demonstrably they successfully combined public and private concerns and devoted considerable time and energy to local tasks as well as administrative work within the regions. Their political adventurism and private enterprise took them throughout the South, enabling them to form valuable and lucrative ties within the greater aristocracy. Mixing with their own kin and colleagues, they also acted with, and for, resident and non-resident nobles who utilised their skills in estate-management, as lawyers, administrators and councillors. Yet the crown benefited most from the leading gentry who ran its estates, worked tirelessly in the shires and, significantly, administered the royal household and attended the King.

¹⁶⁸. For Nicholas Gaynesford, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 21; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 546.

¹⁶⁹. For Thomas Fiennes, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 180; see also Myers, *op.cit.*, (Vol. L), p. 222.

¹⁷⁰. James Haute was an esquire of the body by June, 1482: *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 323; Martin Haute was a yeoman of the king's household in 1466 and usher of the chamber to the Queen in 1477, see Myers, *op.cit.*, (Vol. L), p. 217; for Elizabeth Darcy, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 241.

¹⁷¹. For Sir William Brandon, *Wedgwood*, pp. 102-3.

¹⁷². For Bourghier, *Wedgwood*, p. 95; for Sir William Haute, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 125; for Lewkenor, B.L. Stowe Ms 440, f. 70v; for Wingfield, *Wingfield, op.cit.*, p. 27.

An examination of the power-structure within the South has revealed the crown's considerable presence in both a 'physical' sense and in terms of its holdings, which, added to those of the nobility created for the leading gentry a huge pool of preferment. Through mediating royal and noble concerns in regions largely free from intrusive magnate interests, a clique of men in the South held a considerable degree of political power and independence. The solidarity which bound the group within their own class transcended county boundaries and extended throughout the South including prominent nobles and leading courtiers in a mutually beneficial network.

Needless to say, the gentry's power and influence derived from the crown which exerted a controlling and stabilising influence over southern society. The crown, in recognising and utilising the skills of the gentry, rewarding them with offices in the household and in central administration, enabled them to further their contacts, to meet and mix with leading courtiers and powerful nobles, with and by whom they received further employment in the regions; this, in turn, enabled leading families to reinforce and consolidate their position. It was, in fact, the crown which facilitated the sorts of gentry service which give rise to the notion of an 'inter-regional' dimension to gentry activity. Their own wealth, power and status among their peers and within a broader socio-political framework saw the gentry well-placed in 1483 to mount a revolt against Richard III.

Yet while their own position within the aristocracy is clear, just how representative of the leading gentry were they? Further, given their prominence and position within the aristocracy, is it probable that they acted in isolation? These questions form an integral part of the following discussion: the size and significance of 'Buckingham's rebellion'.

CHAPTER 5

THE SIZE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF 'BUCKINGHAM'S REBELLION'

A study of any rising against the crown requires a quantitative analysis to help assess its significance. When on 18 October 1483 a large slice of political society rose against Richard III, its ranks included an uncomfortable number of leading knights, esquires and gentlemen. Clearly the most pressing task is to determine the proportion of leading southern gentry who rose against the crown.¹ This will best reflect the weight of the movement and the overall numbers involved. Just how representative of the top gentry were the proscribed? Before focussing on these people, however, a comprehensive list of rebels will be made including those formally attainted, and those who escaped attainder but were indicted by the King's officials. The second part of the discussion will look at probabilities and possibilities - important figures from the South and elsewhere, who might well have been implicated in 1483 including those who managed to back away at the right moment, or who kept their heads down, along with those whose loyalty to the regime was suspect and who lost important county offices directly after the rising. In addition, an analysis of the pardon rolls from February - July, 1484 will indicate the categories of people who petitioned for pardon early in 1484: the members of the royal household, leading officials and bureaucrats, those in estate-management or who served as minor officials in the ports and on the land; men who worked in the households or on estates of prominent rebels as well as groups who petitioned for pardon from towns, religious institutions and the universities. While it is impossible to gauge their involvement, the petitions for pardon will help bring home the significance of the rising in relation to its perceived weight by the crown. Many of these people either saw themselves as 'high risk', or felt they were in the crown's sights as such, and thus petitioned for pardon to protect themselves from the crown's wrath or from possible enemies who could implicate them.²

An assessment of the size of the revolt against Richard III presents a number of difficulties. The Act of Attainder passed in Richard's parliament of January, 1484, providing the only extant official list of rebels, minimises its duration and falls short of supplying a realistic assessment of those involved. At the other end of the scale an attempt to gauge raw numbers must remain purely speculative, although there are indications of thousands of rebels in revolt within the regions. Generally, historians have pointed to the ease with which Richard III

1. It is proposed to base the analysis on the sample of fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen; see Appendix 5 for the rebels, including those who avoided attainder in the centres of revolt.

2. See Arthurson, 'The Rising of 1497: A Revolt of the Peasantry', p. 11.

crushed the rebellion. Caught off guard at Lincoln on 11 October, the King responded with zeal, and, as events unfolded he was able to advance quickly to Salisbury and on to Exeter, and, as P.M. Kendall notes, was back in London just seventeen days later. Kendall writes of the apathy of the English people, emphasising that 'great numbers' did not flock to Buckingham's cause; that few of the 'commons' were aroused and that those who did spring to arms were quick to desert.³ The extant sources, in fact, belie this statement. In both the East and the West many reacted against the King and were in revolt for the best part of a month.⁴ The act stipulates 18 October as the day on which the risings at Maidstone, Rochester, Gravesend, Guildford, Newbury, Salisbury, Exeter and Brecon occurred. Yet Kent had risen prematurely by at least 10 October;⁵ while at Brecon Buckingham was prepared well before this date.⁶ In the West leaders such as Thomas Arundel and Edward Courtenay had gathered at Exeter, while further east Walter Hungerford and others were grouped ready for action at Salisbury by 17 October.⁷

The King, moreover, was aware of trouble in the South from at least September, possibly earlier. The concern behind his directive on 22 September to the sheriff of Southampton outlawing retaining and the use of liveries is apparent behind his general attack on the practice which caused 'great division and jeopardy'.⁸ It is not a coincidence that on the following day the bishop of Salisbury, Lionel Woodville lost his lands in Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Berkshire and Southampton.⁹ Taking 18 October as the acknowledged start of the rising, much of the South was in revolt 'officially' for almost a month; in reality, the disaffection had just begun.

In the West Country much of Cornwall was raised in late October after it became clear that plans had gone seriously wrong in Devonshire. The rising in Exeter, raised on 18 October was abortive, and neither Buckingham nor Henry Tudor had appeared. Yet a number of the rebel

3. Kendall, *op.cit.*, pp. 175, 273.

4. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 154.

5. On 15 October William Clifford of Iwade, Kent, was arrested, see *Norfolk Household Books*, p. 472; Green, *op.cit.*, p. 159; *The Great Chronicle of London*, pp. 234-6. The Weald had risen by 10 October and on the 11th Norfolk sent his men to Gravesend and Rochester: *Norfolk Household Books*, pp. 70-1; *Annales*, p. 775.

6. See the Plumpton Correspondence, *op.cit.*, pp. 44-5, where Edward Plumpton, in a letter to Sir Robert, noted on the 18th that Buckingham had already gathered a force.

7. Allegedly a servant of the sheriff of Cornwall making his way to the exchequer, was waylaid and robbed at Warminster by Walter Hungerford and others, see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 155.

8. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 22.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

leaders retreated to Bodmin, Cornwall, where they attracted 'multitudes of people arrayed in warlike manner'.¹⁰ The collapse of the revolt in the West in the shadow of the royal host did not end the conflict. In an open letter to the mayors, inhabitants and officers of Plymouth and Saltash on 13 November, Richard warned them to 'assist' Sir Thomas Malyverer for 'as long as he shall continue there'.¹¹ On 6 December, 1483 the crown noted disturbances at Gloucester, only one of the 'divisions and inconveniences' which had 'risen...in diverse places within...[the] realm'.¹² Around this time Richard imposed an oath of fealty on Southampton.¹³

In the South East a number of rebels, pursued by the crown through Kent and Surrey from 18 to 24 October, retreated to Bodiam Castle, Sussex, where they held out against the King's forces until the second week of November.¹⁴ Yet as in the West tension remained high. With the duke of Norfolk's men still riding in the South East in late November, Richard was driven to impose an oath of loyalty on Rochester and Sandwich (as with Southampton) and warn against retaining (as with Plymouth) in January 1484.¹⁵ In addition tenants and servants of Buckingham and Rivers and leading rebels such as John Fogge, John and Richard Guildford, George Brown, John Darell and others remained disaffected well into the new year.¹⁶ Again, here as in the West, many were involved in rebellion. Sixteenth century chronicler John Stow responsible for the only surviving account of the rising in the South East wrote that when 'Buckingham was up in the West Country there were many up in Kent; to wit Sir George Brown...with many other to the number of five thousand'. Clearly Stow's estimate cannot safely be taken literally. Nor, however, given the stature of the attainted gentry can it be altogether dismissed.¹⁷

Not suprisingly the Act of Attainder lists among its one hundred traitors many of the most prominent knights and esquires in southern England. Seventy, in fact were gentry (53 esquires and 17 knights) including the sample, most of whom (as noted) were both leading county gentry

10. Royal Institution of Cornwall: Ms BV. 1/4.

11. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 34-5.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

13. Southampton R.O., SC 5/1/19 fos. 28v, 31v; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 158.

14. Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 108.

15. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 69, 75-7.

16. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 75-7; for Buckingham's lands of Tonbridge and Penshurst, *ibid.*, pp. 71, 81; for Milton and Marden, Clarence's former lands managed by George Brown, *ibid.*, pp. 77, 82; for Guildfords, *ibid.*, pp. 76, 83; for Darell, *ibid.*, p. 76, for Fogge, *ibid.*; see also Ms BV. 1/4 for servants of Arundel and Courtenay.

17. *Annales*, p. 461.

and also members of the royal household, calculated to have been at any one time in excess of four hundred persons.¹⁸ For convenience the names of all the attainted from the official act of January, 1484 will be included in the text.¹⁹ From Exeter, Sir Thomas Arundel, Roger Bolter, gentleman, Edward Courtenay, Walter Courtenay, Richard Cruse yeoman of the crown, William Froste yeoman of the crown, John Halwell, Thomas Lovell gentleman, John Moton gentleman, Richard Nanfan, Thomas Pyne gentleman, Sir Thomas St Leger knight of the body, John Treffry, William Treffry gentleman, John Trevelyan esquire, John Welles and Sir Robert Willoughby. From Salisbury John Avery, yeoman (servant of Sir Giles Daubenay), gentlemen, William Bampton, William Baskett and John Bevyn, Robert Bowden yeoman (servant of Daubenay), Thomas Brown gentleman, Robert Canon yeoman (servant of Daubenay), gentlemen William Case, John Champney and Humphrey Cheyney, John Cheyney esquire of the body, Robert Cheyney gentleman, Walter Cole yeoman (servant of Daubenay), Sir Giles Daubenay knight of the body, John Fesaunt, gentleman, John Forde yeoman (servant of Daubenay), gentlemen William Hall, John Heron and John Hignons, Walter Hungerford esquire of the body, John Knolles yeoman, William Knight yeoman of the crown, Sir Nicholas Latimer, Thomas Lynde, John Melbourne gentleman, Thomas Melbourne esquire, John Shirwell yeoman (servant of Daubenay), Michael Skilling, Sir John St Lo, John Trenchard esquire, John Watts yeoman and James Worsley.

Involved at Newbury, Sir Richard Beauchamp and Sir William Berkeley esquire of the body under Edward, were attainted along with Sir Thomas Delamare, gentleman Edmund Hampden, John Harcourt esquire, Roger Kelsale, yeoman, Sir William Norris knight of the body, William Uvedale esquire of the body, Sir William Overey, Amias Paulet, William Stonor knight of the body, and Sir Roger Tocotes, Walter Williams and Richard Woodville. In the South East the proscribed were William Brandon esquire of the body, John Boutayn yeoman of the crown, Robert Brewes gentleman, Sir George Brown knight of the body, William Clifford esquire of the body, Alexander Culpepper gentleman, John Darell esquire, Thomas Fiennes esquire of the body, Richard Fisher yeoman of the crown, Sir John Fogge, John Gaynesford esquire, Nicholas Gaynesford esquire of the body, John Guildford knight, Richard Guildford esquire and Richard Haute 'king's servant', John Hoo yeoman of the crown, gentleman James Horne, Anthony Kene esquire, Sir Thomas Lewkenor, Roger Long yeoman, William Loveday

¹⁸. D. A. L. Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', *Royal Historical Society Transactions*, Fifth Series, Vol. XXIII (1973), p. 2; for the following names, *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, pp. 245-6.

¹⁹. It needs to be stressed that these men were indicted for rebellion at Exeter, Newbury and so on. They were not usually inhabitants of the towns; and some were from different regions from those in which they were proscribed, as set down in the Act of Attainder.

yeoman, Richard Potter yeoman of the crown, Edward Poynings esquire, John Pympe esquire, Reginald Pympe gentleman, Thomas Rither (Rider) esquire, Robert Walter and William Strode yeoman of the crown. Finally, John Rushe was attainted with Buckingham at Brecon.

In sum the act lists twenty-eight attainders at Maidstone: four knights, twelve esquires and four gentlemen (seven yeoman and one without a style); from Newbury fourteen attainders: eight knights, two esquires, one gentleman and one merchant (and one yeoman); in Wiltshire, thirty-two proscribed: three knights, four esquires and fourteen gentlemen (ten yeomen and one without a style); sixteen attainted at Exeter: three knights, six esquires and five gentlemen (and two yeomen). In addition John Welles of Maxey, Northamptonshire was attainted for rising in August, 1483, while Alexander Cheyney and Sir Edward Woodville omitted from the January act, are described as such in December 1484.²⁰

Before assessing and analysing the proportion of leading gentry represented in the act, and to help gauge the depth of the revolt the discussion will focus on additional names which augment the Act of Attainder. Clearly the act identifies only a small percentage of those involved. The names of other rebels are listed in the commissions of arrest instituted after the rising, and in the extant indictments.²¹ Of value are two such indictments taken before Lord Scrope of Bolton at Torrington (Devon) and Bodmin (Cornwall). The former survived and was used by Raphael Holinshed in the sixteenth century, who furnishes interesting detail taken from John Hooker, historian of Exeter concerning a list of 500 rebels indicted before Scrope at Torrington.²² Among the most prominent are Sir Thomas Fulford, Sir John Crocker, Bartholomew St Leger (brother of Sir Thomas), John Norris (brother of Sir William), Thomas

20. B.L.H.M., Vol. 2, p. 43; Horrox, 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', Appendix.

21. Others implicated lost offices or commissions, entered bonds for good behaviour or sought insurance in the form of a pardon; these cases will be dealt with later in the discussion.

22. The document concerning an inquisition taken at Bodmin before Lord Scrope of Bolton implies, at least, the involvement of much of the county. The manuscript which came to light at the end of the nineteenth century among the papers of the Le Grice family, is now to be found in a Memoranda Book among the Borlase papers held at the Royal Institution of Cornwall: Ms BV. 1/4. See Borlase, *op.cit.*, p. 30. The indictments provide nine of the eighteen names of those who were subsequently attainted at Exeter, as well as those who avoided attainder: from Hooker, the marquis of Dorset, Peter Courtenay, bishop of Exeter, Thomas St Leger, Robert Willoughby, Thomas Arundel, John Halwell and Walter Courtenay; from Bodmin, Edward Courtenay and John Treffry, as well as the bishop of Exeter and Thomas Arundel; Holinshed, *op.cit.*, p. 421.

Greenfield, Hugh Lutterell, Robert Burnaby and William Chilson.²³ In addition the indictment of the Bodmin rebels before Scrope includes Ralph Arundell, Geoffrey Beauchamp, Remfry Densell, John Rosogan and Thomas Borlase who crossed to Brittany with Courtenay.²⁴ Other names of 'official' rebels are found in Harley Manuscript 433 - men indicted before the King's agents who were termed 'traitor' and lost lands, but who escaped attainder. In Cornwall Stephen Calmady and James Bonythen, esquire; in Dorset, Thomas Audley esquire of the body, John Cheverell esquire, William Twynyho esquire and Richard Morton; Somerset - gentleman, William Hody and Thomas Bourgchier, knight of the body; Buckinghamshire-Bedfordshire - knights Richard Enderby and John Donne; Norfolk-Suffolk - Sir William Brandon and William Loveday; and in Kent - John Waller esquire and Stephen Gerard. Among the men termed 'rebels and traitors' in a royal proclamation issued in Kent were Sir William Haute, William Cheyney, John Wingfield, John Isley, Ralph Tykull, John Alsey, Anthony Brown, Robert Brent, Richard Latimer and Roger Long.²⁵

The Harley Manuscript 433 sheds light on a number of the above and others who were captured or having fled, had their goods or land seized after the rebellion: Cornish knight Sir Henry Bodrugan took possession of 'our rebel' Stephen Calmady's vessel on 21 November. Calmady from Devon had assisted John Cheyney, Giles Daubenay and John Halwell in their escape to Brittany.²⁶ It was around this time that Yorkshireman, Robert Redness was captured in Sussex and his father John described as a rebel.²⁷ In Surrey Sir Thomas Bourgchier's land was seized in the autumn of 1483, followed by the estates of James Bonythen in February 1484. Walter Mitchell, mayor of Southampton, was later attainted for his role in the rising, and most probably his dealings with William Berkeley constable of the city and in residence there

23. Holinshed, *op.cit.*

24. Borlase, *op.cit.* Remfry Arundel of Lanherne was perhaps the brother or uncle of Thomas Arundel of Lanherne. He was sheriff in 1463, see W. Lake, *A Complete Parochial History of the County of Cornwall*, Part I (London, 1867), p. 227.

25. For Audley, Cheverell, Twynyho and Richard Morton, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 31; for Hody and Bourgchier, Enderby and Donne, *ibid.*, p. 32; James Bonythen esquire, *ibid.*, p. 89; for Brandon and Loveday, *ibid.*, p. 175; for Waller, *ibid.*, p. 109; for Haute, Cheyney, Wingfield, Isley, Tykull, Alsey, Brown, Brent and Roger, *ibid.*, p. 48; for Richard Latimer, *ibid.*, p. 39; for Gerard, *ibid.*, p. 116.

26. For Calmady and Cheyney *et.al.*, P.R.O., C82/55/6, and see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 159; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 37.

27. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 184.

on 8 and 21 October.²⁸ Further east Walter Roberts was attainted for sheltering Sir John Guildford.²⁹ Detail is provided of rebels from various sectors who later joined forces such as William Norris and John Cheyney who, with other rebels 'in great number' met up with Buckingham's servant and customer of Poole, John Kymer, called to account at the exchequer. R. Horrox writes that Kymer, realising that Cheyney and Norris lay between him and the exchequer, sent his servant instead who was robbed by the latter. It is far more likely however, particularly in view of his subsequent activity, that Kymer was in collaboration with the rebels and faked, for effect, the robbery of his servant. It could well be that he joined the rebels in Brittany for on 4 February, 1484 his goods in Poole were seized, Kymer 'late customer within our port...' having 'departed and gone away with certain duties amounting to a great sum of money...by reason of our customs there'. In fact the revenue collectors were well-placed to abscond to Brittany with their taxes or to 'disappear' with the crown's money, sent off to assist the colony in exile. In view of the proportion of revenue collectors indicted for revolt, this is certainly a possibility, and it could well be that as the months went by, royal funds were siphoned for the rebels' use in this way.³⁰ Taken from the commissions of arrest, the manuscript also cites the treason of William Tyler, John Waller esquire and James Newenham, the latter indicted for his treasonable activity in July 1484,³¹ and others of some note such as William Collingbourne, a serjeant of the pantry by 1464 and a gentleman usher at Edward's funeral. Collingbourne along with Sir John Turberville of Bradford, Wiltshire, and Robert Turberville of Friarmayne, Dorset, was the subject of a powerful commission in November 1484, for urging Henry Tudor to invade England, which resulted in his and Robert Turberville's imprisonment. Around this time John Belbury, John Lenne and John Toser were arrested for assisting Richard Edgecombe to France, while in December, 1484, John Bale forfeited lands in Cambridgeshire, backdated to Christmas 1483.

John Fortescue, gentleman porter of Calais, pardoned in February, 1484 also lost his lands in December for his part in the escape of the earl of Oxford, with Sir Walter Blount, captain of the Hammes garrison, John Risley, Newbury rebel Sir William Stonor, Ralph Penne and others.

28. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 157. See also Horrox, 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V', p. 233, for Berkeley as constable of Southampton.

29. For Walter Roberts, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 166; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 145.

30. See Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 159; see also Horrox, 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V', p. 227 and *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 85 for Kymer.

31. For Tyler, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 155; Tyler, in fact, was knighted by Henry Tudor in 1485, see below; for Waller, *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 109; for James Newenham, P.R.O., C81/1392/12.

³² Some were penalised, pardoned and further penalised for their treason. For example Sir William Brandon of Soham Court, Cambridgeshire, father of William esquire (attainted at Maidstone) and Thomas esquire (listed, Exeter), rose at Maidstone. Neither attainted nor listed in contemporary sources, Brandon, who spent the first twelve months of Richard's reign in sanctuary at Westminster, because 'he dared not exercise his office in person', forfeited lands in January. Pardoned in March, it was not until his treason in the following October with Blount, Risley and others that he lost further lands in November and in the following February along with Tocotes and Robert Willoughby.³³ A number of others were indicted in 1485 including lawyer Robert Morton and John Pole.

Renaissance historian Polydore Vergil augments the Act of Attainder and the lists of rebels with the names of those allegedly in Brittany with Henry Tudor: John Bourghier and Evan Morgan. In addition, according to Vergil Edward Poynings escaped to Flanders with John Morton.³⁴ The mid-sixteenth century chronicler Raphael Holinshed mentions the revolt of Edward Poynings, 'a politic captain', while Richard Grafton whose chronicle was published in 1568, notes the captaincy of Robert Poyntz in the revolt and adds Humphrey Cheyney (brother of John) to Vergil's list of exiles; in addition, sixteenth century chronicler John Stow names Sir John Scott among the rebels.³⁵

A number who might have remained in England without fear of penalty also ventured to Brittany. While the names of only a few of the three hundred with Henry Tudor are known, mainly through Vergil's information, the *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII*, largely information found in the relevant *Patent Rolls*, lists the rewards given by Henry Tudor

³². For Collingburne and Turberville, P.R.O., C81/1531/59; for Belbury, Lenne and Toser, P.R.O., C81/1392/17; C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 493; for Bale, B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 239; see also C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 184, 517; C.S.L. Davies, 'Bishop John Morton, the Holy See, and the accession of Henry VII', E.H.R., Vol. CII (1987), p. 6, and more generally, Virgoe, 'Sir John Risley (1443-1512), Courtier and Councillor'.

³³. *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 291; B.L.H.M., Vol. 2, pp. 78, 175, 203-4.

³⁴. Vergil, p. 200; for Sir John Bourghier see below, n. 103; Davies, *op.cit.*, presumably following Vergil, cites Halwell as present in Flanders with John Morton. However the C.P.R., 1485-95, p. 35 cites him as present in Brittany with Henry Tudor. See also B.A. Pocquet du Haut Jussé, *op.cit.*, p. 253.

³⁵. B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 256; for Poynings, Holinshed, *op.cit.*, p. 417; for Scott cited by Stow, Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 105; Scott's rebellion is possible. Certainly he was in trouble in March 1485 when he was placed on a £1000 bond payable to Richard: C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1408. Horrox, 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', Appendix I, for Cheyney.

to friends who shared his exile and others who remained in England.³⁶ Early in the reign around seventy gifts were 'in consideration of the good service...' performed for duty 'beyond the sea and on this side'. Over one third of the recipients were rewarded with grants or offices in the South West, with the remainder evenly spread throughout the South, the Midlands and the North. Recipients include John Halwell, William Knight and Thomas Brown who shared Henry's exile; and others such as Edgecombe, Riseley and Blount who crossed to Brittany late in 1484. In the main, however, the grantees rewarded for service 'beyond the seas' were men not generally recognised as having lived in exile, such as attainted Newbury rebel Edmund Hampden and from the West Walter Courtenay, William Froste, James Bonythen and Stephen Calmady. In addition, kinsmen of leading rebels such as William Willoughby and Anthony and John Brown received patronage for 'service beyond the sea' as did Richard Pigot. The vast majority, however, were men whose names escaped the lists of proscribed; lesser gentry with no known connection with the rebels. From the West Country, John Monkeley, John Ude, Richard Selman, Richard Stanciall, William Mathew, John Upcote, John Spicer and Peter Wright. From the South East, John Martindale, John Wood, Geoffrey Rede, Robert Skerne, Thomas Iden and William Michael. Recipients of offices in the North and Midlands include John Carre, Richard Gill, William Edy, John Hemingway, John Pigge and Henry Goodclerk. Servants of prominent rebels were rewarded such as William Compton, servant of Edward Poynings, and Hugh Richard 'servant unto Lord Welles'.³⁷

Clearly the majority of rebels were lesser men recruited by the leading knights and esquires who fielded companies of friends, retainers and servants. Many such as Edward Courtenay and Thomas Arundel drew into the revolt a number of tenants from their Devon and Cornish estates, as did leading South East rebels Sir John Fogge, John and Richard Guildford, John Darell and others - tenants still involved in insurrection in November and December, 1483. Most, including Poynings, Daubenay and Welles were accompanied into battle and then exile by their own servants and retainers, who formed a close-knit community with Henry Tudor in Brittany.³⁸

Yet while a comprehensive list of the proscribed is important, the whole question of scale is vital. Numbers mean little without a sound indication of the percentage of the leading gentry who rebelled. It has been observed that the sample of rebels were connected with the royal household either directly or indirectly. By 1483 there were around forty esquires of the body and between twenty and thirty knights of the body; of the former, twenty-four were from the

36. *Materials*, Vol. 1, *passim*.

37. For Compton and Richard, *op.cit.*, pp. 44, 272. It is unlikely that this Richard Pigot is the serjeant-at-law, but it may be so.

38. R.A. Griffiths and R.S. Thomas, *op.cit.*, p. 108; *Materials*, Vol. 1, p. 272.

South;³⁹ six of these were attainted, and another four listed as rebels. In general terms, forty-six percent of Edward's esquires in the South, revolted. Of the remainder, five lost peace commissions after Richard's bid for power, while another two, John Risley and John Fortescue rebelled in 1484.⁴⁰ Of the twenty-two 'known' knights of the body under Edward, seven rebelled, six of whom were attainted. More importantly, of the ten southern knights included in the figure, six - or a remarkable sixty percent - rose in 1483.⁴¹

Based on these figures and still in general terms, the attainted rebels represent a striking percentage of leading southern gentry, not least because the percentage is based on the 'known' rebels. Another accurate yardstick involves an analysis of the sample of fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen in the context of their appointments to the shrievalty and as peace commissioners in the last years of Edward IV's reign. In relation to the latter, the survey will also shed light on prominent county knights who did not rebel and those who were omitted from the commissions directly after the rising. Does the analysis of the peace commissions reflect the percentage of leading gentry involved?

Of considerable influence within the county, the sheriffs and peace commissioners were the conduit for royal authority and magnate power to the local communities. The pre-requisites for the office of sheriff demanded that the recipient be a resident landowner of some note and one of the ruling elite within the county.⁴² Although the fifteenth century witnessed an erosion of the sheriff's powers, his role in the execution of the legal process and as addressee and server of the writs ensured him power and influence within the county. Originally occupied by baronial families, by the fifteenth century the shrievalty had become the preserve of the gentry of

39. Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 323; see Appendix 1 for esquires and knights of the body.

40. The attainted esquires of the body are William Berkeley, John Cheyney, Thomas Fiennes, Nicholas Gaynesford and Walter Hungerford; those listed as rebels: Thomas Audley, John Norris, Robert Poyntz and John Wingfield; esquires of the body who lost peace commissions under Richard: Thomas Croft (Oxon), Thomas Darcy (Essex), John Wikes (Gloucs), Thomas Fowler (Oxon), John Sturgeon (Hants); see below for an analysis of Richard's peace commissions in the South.

41. The attainted knights of the body from the South are Thomas St Leger, William Stonor, William Norris, George Brown and Giles Daubenay, while Thomas Bourghier was listed as a rebel; in addition, Edward Woodville (Northants) was also attainted: see Appendix 1.

42. W.A. Morris, 'The Sheriff during the Reign of Edward III', *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, pp. 47-8; R. Virgoe, 'The Crown, Magnates, and Local Government in Fifteenth-Century East Anglia', *The Crown and Local Communities in England and France in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J.R.L. Highfield and R. Jeffs (Gloucester, 1981), p. 73.

upper and middling status. From 1461, however, there was a concerted effort by the crown to appoint men of higher status than in previous years, particularly noticeable during Edward IV's later years as evidenced by the sample: Thirteen of the twenty-three occupants were of knightly status, with eight esquires and two gentlemen. The appointees, selected by the council and then pricked by the King, were clearly among the pre-eminent gentry of the shires they represented.⁴³

The years selected for the survey are 1478-1482; the counties: Cornwall, Devonshire, Somerset-Dorset, Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Hampshire, Oxfordshire-Berkshire, Kent, Surrey-Sussex, Norfolk-Suffolk. In total, twenty-four of the fifty sheriffs rebelled in 1483: ⁴⁴ in 1478, Sir Robert Willoughby, Edward Courtenay, John Norris and Walter Hungerford; in 1479, Richard Nanfan, William Uvedale, Sir John Fogge and Sir William Knyvet; in 1480, Willoughby again, Sir John St Lo, Sir George Brown, Sir Thomas Delamare, Sir Giles Daubenay and Thomas Fiennes; in 1481, Sir Thomas Fulford, Daubenay, Richard Haute, Sir William Norris and Richard Morton; while in the following year, John Treffry, Sir William Haute, John Wingfield and Robert Poyntz, replaced in May by future rebel William Berkeley.

The analysis indicates that forty-eight percent of the leading gentry who occupied the shrievalty in the above counties between 1478-1482 participated in 'Buckingham's rebellion'. From the leading ranks of country society, these men were wealthy, influential and close to the King. Further, the nature of the dual shrievalties of Somerset-Dorset, Oxfordshire-Berkshire, Norfolk-Suffolk and Surrey-Sussex, meant that in these areas the sheriff's power tended to be regional rather than confined to one county.⁴⁵

So too, the peace commissioners appointed by the advice of the chancellor and the council were men from the same ranks. Providing another link between court and county, their importance in county administration superseded that of the sheriffs. With wide-ranging judicial powers, the peace commissioners were selected from 'the most sufficient' residents of

⁴³. Acheson, *op.cit.*, p. 122; Virgoe, 'The Crown, Magnates and Local Government in Fifteenth Century East Anglia', pp. 75-6. For the following information see *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 2-153.

⁴⁴. See Appendix 2; see also below, Part 4, for further discussion on the sheriffs. It should be noted that Robert Poyntz, elected sheriff of Hampshire in November, 1482, was replaced by Sir William Berkeley in May, 1483. Poyntz was implicated in the revolt, Berkeley, attainted.

⁴⁵. Virgoe, 'The Crown, Magnates and Local Government in Fifteenth Century East Anglia', pp. 77-9.

the shire. By the fifteenth century the office attracted the most eminent county gentry drawn by its power as well as its prestige.⁴⁶

It is proposed to analyse the last peace commission of Edward IV's reign in Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire, Southampton (Hampshire), Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Kent, Surrey, Sussex, Norfolk and Suffolk. There are wide chronological variations within the counties.⁴⁷ For example the last commission of the reign in Surrey occurred on 24 September, 1479, and in Dorset on 3 March, 1483; in Cornwall on 23 March, 1480; in Southampton, 17 January, 1481; Wiltshire, 10 February, 1481; Gloucestershire, 25 October, 1481; in Kent on 18 November, 1481; Sussex, 5 December, 1481; Suffolk, 18 April, 1482; Devon, 18 June, 1482; Norfolk, 13 November, 1482; Somerset, 7 November, 1482; in Berkshire, 13 February, 1483 and in Oxfordshire on 18 February. Thirty-three of the rebels from the sample were named on the peace commissions for these counties: the Cornwall commission (1480) contained no rebels; in Devonshire (1482), knights Robert Willoughby, John Crocker and Thomas St Leger, along with John Halwell; for Dorset (1483), Sir Nicholas Latimer and Thomas Arundel, John Cheyney, John Cheverell and Richard Morton; in Somerset (1482), Sir Giles DAubenay and John Trevelyan; Wiltshire (1481), Sir Roger Tocotes, Sir Richard Beauchamp, John Cheyney and Walter Hungerford; Southampton (1481) Sir Thomas St Leger and esquires William Berkeley and William Uvedale; Gloucestershire (1481) Sir John St Lo; Oxfordshire (1483), Sir William Stonor and John Harcourt; Berkshire (1483), Sir William Norris, Sir Thomas Delamare and Alexander Cheyney; Kent (1481), knights John Fogge, Thomas Bourghier, William Haute, John Scott, and Roger Brent; Surrey (1479), Thomas St Leger, George Brown, John and Nicholas Gaynesford; Sussex (1481), Sir Thomas Lewkenor; Norfolk (1482), Sir William Knyvet; and for Suffolk (1482), Sir William Brandon and John Wingfield.

As Thomas St Leger occupied three places on the commissions (Devonshire, Wiltshire and Surrey), John Cheyney, two, (Dorset and Wiltshire) and William Berkeley, two (Southampton and Gloucestershire) - effectively, thirty-seven positions on Edward IV's last peace commissions were occupied by rebels. A breakdown of their social composition reveals the following: Of the thirteen counties surveyed, 195 positions (excluding nobles and ecclesiastics) were held by the gentry. Of these, thirty-one were high-flying legal careerists who occupied fifty positions, while another thirty-one were county lawyers occupying as many places; of the remaining 114 positions, seven were occupied by men who were dead or ennobled by October 1483

⁴⁶. In general see J.R. Lander, *English Justices of the Peace, 1461-1509* (Gloucester, 1989). For the following information see C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 555-577.

⁴⁷. See Appendix 3 for a breakdown of the peace commissions listing nobles, ecclesiastics, legal careerists, country lawyers and rebels: knights, esquires and gentlemen.

leaving one hundred and seven of the wealthiest country knights and esquires. Again of these, thirty-seven positions were filled by rebels. On the basis of these figures, thirty-four percent (34.5%) of the leading gentry rebelled in 1483.

The striking feature, however, is the number of leading knights and esquires (most particularly of the body) represented in the figure. In total forty knights are on the commissions; by October 1483 four were dead (Vaughan, Nottingham, Fiennes and Sandes); of the remaining thirty-six, seventeen rebelled (all sample gentry), including six knights of the body: Thomas St Leger, William Norris, William Stonor, Giles Daubenay, Thomas Bourghier and George Brown. Of the two remaining knights of the body, Gilbert Debenham and Robert Chamberlain, the latter was only reinstated to his former position in February, 1485. The sample also includes twenty-seven esquires in total (excluding John Carent and John Cassy who were dead by 1483) of whom ten were esquires of the body; of the twenty-seven, twelve rebelled, including seven of the esquires of the body.⁴⁸

Not surprisingly, given the constraints of such a survey and the variables involved, the percentage from the peace commissions is substantially short of the sample of sheriffs and the overall percentage of household knights and esquires who rebelled. The mean from the survey of sheriffs and peace commissioners is forty percent - which can be taken to represent the top gentry in the South who rose against Richard III. While these findings are remarkable, this figure does not take into account many others (including some nobles) from the South, the Midlands and the North, who were implicated in the rising. In fact, the peace commissions supplement the Act of Attainder. While the act has been augmented by other sources enabling a full list of proscribed, the peace commissions further add to our knowledge of both the depth and breadth of the revolt. As the act masks the size and duration of the rebellion, it also minimises its geographical extent. At face value 'Buckingham's rebellion' involved 'Kent to St Michael's Mount'. In reality, however, it was more extensive incorporating East Anglia: Cambridgeshire and Essex as well as Norfolk and Suffolk, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire and perhaps further North as well.⁴⁹

This may be borne out by an analysis of the commissions which suggests that many others, knights, esquires and nobles throughout the country were implicated in the revolt. With the exception of the 'known' proscribed, the following discussion will identify the southern gentry excluded from the peace commissions directly after Edward's death in April and Richard's

⁴⁸. See Appendix 1 for Edward IV's knights and esquires of the body.

⁴⁹. Green, *op.cit.*, p. 588; Essex is placed third in the Crowland Chronicler's account, see *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, pp.162-3.

accession in June before concentrating on those omitted after the October rebellion. While the latter are of most concern, many in eclipse in May and June were almost certainly involved in the later insurrection, and doubtless remained disaffected until the end of the reign. In turn, those from further afield will be identified in the same order. Clearly, not all those excluded from peace commissions were out of favour or disaffected. Death, or transferral of interests, landed and political would doubtless explain a number; yet again, others were disaffected or under suspicion, reflected in their absence on the peace commissions at significant stages in 1483. Of those withdrawn after the rising, clearly some had pulled back from rebellion at the last moment, and with others went to ground in the counties during Richard's reign emerging either to join Henry Tudor abroad or await his arrival in England.

The following lost their commissions when Richard made his bid for power in May, and remained in eclipse throughout the reign except where stated otherwise:⁵⁰ From Cornwall, Sir John Colshull, John Carminew (reinstated July 1483), Thomas Bere (reinstated December 1483), Thomas Tresawell, Thomas Limbery and Michael Petite (the latter, reinstated July 1483); from Devonshire, Sir William Courtenay (reinstated in June 1483) and John Sapcote esquire; from Southampton, Sir William Sandes, John Coke (reinstated June 1483) and John Brocas (reinstated June 1483); from Gloucestershire, Thomas Baynham (reinstated February 1484), Kenelm Digas, Richard Forster; from Buckinghamshire, Sir Edmund Rede, John Gifford, Roger Dinham (reinstated November 1484) and Richard Grey; from Middlesex, Henry Frowick; from Kent Richard Lee (reinstated June 1483); in Norfolk John Paston and Sir Henry Ogard; from Suffolk, Sir Gilbert Debenham (reinstated June); Sir John Heveningham, Sir Henry Wentworth (reinstated, June 1483) and Robert Chamberlain (reinstated February 1485).⁵¹

50. For the following information see *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 535-580. It is not proposed to include the following legal careerists: Thomas Bridge, William Jenney, John Sulyard, Richard Nele, William Hussey and Richard Pigot. As justices of the king's bench and serjeants-at-law, these men worked the south-western, eastern, midland and northern circuits and their omission from commissions was due to a change of circuit. An exception may be Pigot, a serjeant-at-law who was omitted from Norfolk, Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire; a namesake is cited as being with Henry Tudor in Brittany, who could just be this Pigot; see *P.R.O.*, Prob. 11/10, f. 102v for the will of a Richard Pigot, perhaps father of the rebel.

51. For Brocas, *P.R.O.*, C67/51/16; see also *V.C.H.*, Hampshire, Vol. 3, pp. 212-13 and *Wedgwood*, p. 221; for Baynham and Forster, *ibid.*, pp. 53, 347; Frowick was frequently on Middlesex commissions from 1461 including the Readeption, but not under Richard, resuming his work in September, 1485; for Frowick and Ogard, *ibid.*, pp. 353, 644; for Heveningham, *P.R.O.*, C67/51/30.

Those removed from the commissions in the South at the time of Richard's accession: in Cornwall, Thomas Luccombe esquire (reinstated December 1483), Thomas Granvile (reinstated November 1484) and John Penfoun; from Somerset Edmund George (reinstated December 1483); from Wiltshire, John Whitoksmede; from Southampton, John Paulet; from Oxfordshire, Thomas Croft and Thomas Danvers (reinstated, December 1483); from Berkshire, John Isbury (reinstated December 1483) and William Stafferton; from Surrey, William Essex, Thomas Basset esquire, William Marston, William Donnington and Thomas Wintershull; from Sussex, Sir Thomas Etchingham, Thomas Stidolf, Robert Woodfold, Sir Henry Rose and Sir William Nottingham; from Suffolk John Heveningham and Sir John Cheyney; from Cambridgeshire, Henry Langley; from Essex, John Ingoldesby, Robert Plummer (reinstated December 1483), Richard Grey, Sir William Nottingham and Thomas Darcy; in Bedfordshire, Sir Richard Enderby, Richard Carlisle and John Laurence (reinstated October 1484) and finally in Hertfordshire, John Leventhorpe the elder, John Forster servant of the late Lord Hastings, and Robert Clifford.⁵²

Little significance should be attached to the omission of Sir William Courtenay, John Sapcote, Gilbert Debenham and perhaps, Richard Lee. A powerful West Country knight, Courtenay was on all Richard's commissions in the West, and was described as king's servant. Likewise, Sapcote, an esquire of the body to Edward IV remained as such under Richard, collecting as well numerous offices in the West, in Hertfordshire and in Rutland. Suffolk knight Gilbert Debenham, a retainer of the Mowbray and Howard dukes of Norfolk was king's carver, 1471-83 and in 1483 became one of Richard's knights of the body, while Richard Lee, busy in the South East under Edward, worked just as hard for the new King, reaping rewards in his principal county, Buckinghamshire.⁵³ Yet again, the reversal of policy in regard to others such

52. For Luccombe, *Wedgwood*, p. 558; for Croft, P.R.O., C67/51/7; *Wedgwood*, p. 240; although Sir William Nottingham was dead by 7 September he is worth mentioning; a lawyer of Gloucestershire, he was king's attorney from 1452-83, baron of the exchequer, 1461-83 and an M.P. for Gloucestershire. He was removed from all offices by Richard III. For Rose, P.R.O., C67/51/34. The widow of Darcy's namesake had married Richard Haute, and was mistress of the nursery in 1481.

53. Courtenay was on all Richard's commissions, was sheriff of Devon, 1482-3 and became 'king's servant' to Richard III: *Wedgwood*, p. 231. As John, Lord Dinham's brother-in-law, when the latter became steward of Cornwall by Richard, Sapcote became receiver there 'for good service against the rebels': *Wedgwood*, pp. 740-1; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 348, 430; Lander, *English Justices of the Peace, 1461-1509*, pp. 92-3; Debenham married the widow of William, Lord Zouch and his only daughter married Sir Thomas Brewes. He was 'king's carver', and a retainer of the Mowbray and Howard dukes of Norfolk, and according to *Wedgwood*, p. 266, he avoided Bosworth,

as lawyers Thomas Tresawell and Thomas Limbery suggests a nervousness, at least, on the part of the crown, and quite possibly disaffection among the county lawyers. Colleagues of leading careerists, Hody, Biconell and Bray, they were dropped from the commissions in May, reinstated in June/July, and excluded again after the rebellion. Both men had enjoyed full careers under Edward, representing Launceston and were active on commissions through the 1470s.⁵⁴

The disaffection of others however, was more obvious, and with men like Colshull, Rede, Paston, and Chamberlain, the crown was making a clear statement. From a leading Cornish family, Sir John Colshull had close ties with men such as Edward Courtenay, Robert Willoughby and Thomas Arundel. An intimate of the latter's father, for years he had worked on Edward's commissions in the South West with other leading knights and esquires.⁵⁵ So too Buckinghamshire lawyer Sir Edmund Rede was closely tied with knights William Norris and William Stonor, and nobles such as Lords Stanley and Strange and had been a tireless worker in the Home Counties over the years.⁵⁶ From Norfolk, John Paston, a retainer of the Mowbray duke, was a cousin of Margaret Beaufort who received no patronage at all from Richard III. Likewise his elder brother Sir William also lay low during the period, having received much of his patronage from the Staffords including his seats at Newcastle (1472-5) and at Bedwin (1478 and January, 1483) both in their gift.⁵⁷ Chamberlain, originally from Shropshire, was a knight of the body to Edward by 1475 and immersed as well in county life. Under Richard, however, he lost his peace commission in April, 1483, not regaining his former positions in the household or in East Anglia until February, 1485.⁵⁸

A number were also removed from the bench in the Midlands and the North. Like the above most had helped the crown administer the counties, and were themselves members of the

although a knight of the body: P.R.O.,C67/51/9; Lee received patronage in Buckinghamshire from Richard. He was a kinsman of John Lee (1450-1503) of Addington, Surrey, and of Robert Lee of Huntville and Corsley; a yeoman of the crown 1475-83 he was an M.P. for Plympton in 1478 and was granted this bailiwick with Peter Curtis: *Wedgwood*, p. 532 ; see also P.R.O.,C67/51/27.

54. For Tresawell-Limbery-Hody-Biconell, as well as Michael Petite *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 406; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 355, 395.

55. Colshull (1420-84) of Tremethart and Binhammy, was removed on 27 May and died on 30 March, 1484, see *Wedgwood*, p. 204 and P.R.O., C67/51/28; for Colshull and Sir John Arundel, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 488; for Colshull-Courtenay-Willoughby, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 345.

56. For Rede, *Wedgwood*, p. 711.

57. For John Paston gentleman, P.R.O.,C67/51/16; for Sir William, *Wedgwood*, pp. 666-7.

58. For Chamberlain, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 536; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 509-10.

household.⁵⁹ Excluded in May 1483, from Northamptonshire, Richard Middleton, Robert Pemberton, William Newenham, Sir Walter Mauntell, Sir George Gray of Gray, William Chaumbre, William Sapcote (reinstated December 1483), John Barnard and Richard Gray; from Warwickshire, Thomas Cokesey ; from Derbyshire, John Bothe and Thomas Francis; from Herefordshire, Sir John Barre and Henry Chaumbre; in Nottinghamshire, Thomas Leek esquire of Kirkton and Thomas Merynge; from Lincolnshire - the parts of Holland: Thomas Welby (reinstated June 1483) and John Brown (reinstated December 1483),⁶⁰ Lincolnshire - the parts of Kesteven: Sir John Nedeham (and the parts of Lindsay), Sir Thomas Littilton, (and the parts of Lindsay), Robert Tailboys and John Paynell (reinstated June 1483) ; Lincolnshire - the parts of Lindsay, Sir William Skipwith, Thomas Knight (reinstated June 1483), John Neville and Robert Radcliffe; from Leicestershire, John Turpyn (reinstated May 1485); Cumberland, Sir William Leigh; Westmorland, Sir William Parre, Thomas Middleton, Thomas Bate, Nicholas Taverner, John Wharton and Christopher Baty; Rutlandshire, Sir John Nedeham, Sir Thomas Littleton, John Dall and Brian Talbot,⁶¹ and from Yorkshire, East Riding: Sir Thomas Lumley, John Vavasour the elder (reinstated September 1484), John Hatfield and Marmaduke Constable ; North Riding: Sir Thomas Lumley, Sir John Pickering, Sir William Ewere, William Colvile and Sir Robert Graystoke; West Riding: Sir Henry Vavasour, John Grisacres, Sir Thomas Neville and Sir Robert Rider.

The peace commissioners dropped some weeks later at the time of Richard's coronation were, from Shropshire, Sir John Leighton, Sir Thomas Littleton, Sir Guy Fairfax, Sir William Nottingham, Gilbert Talbot (also from Worcestershire) and Sir John Leighton; Sir Thomas Littleton, Sir Guy Fairfax and William Basset (reinstated March 1485) were omitted in Staffordshire; in Warwickshire, Richard Boughton; Worcestershire, Sir Walter Skull, and Humphrey Stalwey; in Huntingdonshire, Thomas Lowth, Henry Torkington, Sir William Nottingham and Robert Tanfield esquire; from Nottinghamshire, Sir Henry Pierpoint (also

⁵⁹. Again, unless stated otherwise these men remained in eclipse throughout Richard's reign.

⁶⁰. Brown, initially from Derbyshire obtained interests in Buckingham's lordship of Writtle, Essex through his match with Richard Josselyn's daughter. He received the parkership of Writtle from Richard and was probably the yeoman of the cellar under both kings: P.R.O., C67/51/3.

⁶¹. John Turpyn was an associate of John Cheyney, Daubenay and many others, see C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 748; Talbot, through his wife Katherine, widow of Sir John Harrington, obtained manors in Northamptonshire and Rutland; he is listed as an esquire to Richard in May, 1484, see *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 83.

from Derbyshire); from Lincolnshire, the parts of Kesteven: John Walcotes (reinstated December 1483) and finally in Yorkshire: East Riding, Robert Hilyard.⁶²

The brief omission of men such as Constable was a consequence of other duties. Of Flamborough, Yorkshire and also of Lincolnshire, he was the son of Robert Constable, a retainer of the duke of Northumberland under Edward, and was made a knight banneret by the earl in 1480. Under Richard in the latter part of 1483, Constable had much influence in Kent and was later active for the King in the Midlands.⁶³ Yet not all can be explained in this way. For Richard Middleton, Robert Pemberton, Thomas Cokesey, Robert Radcliffe, Gilbert Talbot and Sir Henry Pierpoint, Richard III's accession brought their own eclipse from duties in the counties and at court. Middleton of Belsay, was 'of the household' from 1461 at which time he was knighted; becoming a knight of the body in 1480-3, he took no part after Edward's death. Robert Pemberton of Rushden, Northamptonshire, was an usher of the chamber under Edward IV.⁶⁴ Thomas Cokesey of Camden, Gloucestershire and Cokesay, Worcestershire, became an esquire of the body in 1477-83; off-side through Richard's reign, he became a knight of the body in 1485. Robert Radcliffe, an esquire of the body to Edward, and an associate of Dorset in the weeks preceding the rising, was listed as a king's esquire, but received no patronage from Richard until the end of the reign.⁶⁵ Another esquire of the body (1473-83) Gilbert Talbot, from Shropshire and Grafton, Worcestershire, was the third son of the second earl of Shrewsbury (d. 1460). A king's carver by 1473, he was on the bench until Richard's rise to power.⁶⁶ Finally, Henry Pierpoint of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, was knighted in 1471, and had a full career in both counties again, until the rise of Richard III.⁶⁷

What is clear from the peace commissions is that a solid proportion of the crown's servants - apart from the named rebels - both country gentry and members of the household, were either alienated or themselves under suspicion from the early weeks of Richard's takeover. While it

62. Sir John Leighton (1430-96) of Stretton en le Dale was an M.P. for Shropshire in 1478 and a justice of the peace from December 1468 to June 1483: *Wedgwood*, pp. 534-5.

63. Constable was of Flamborough and Holme on Spalding Moor, Yorkshire, and Somersby, Lincolnshire: *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 46; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 471; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 213; *Wedgwood*, p. 212. Clearly his omission here was a consequence of other duties.

64. *Wedgwood*, p. 591 for Middleton; for Pemberton, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 590 and *P.R.O.*, C67/51/35. Pemberton's colleagues included Catesby and John and Richard Wake; his patronage under Edward was confined to Northamptonshire, see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 101.

65. For Radcliffe as esquire of the body, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 528; see also *Grants, Edward V*, p. 3.

66. For Gilbert Talbot, *Wedgwood*, p. 838.

67. *Wedgwood*, p. 683 and *P.R.O.*, C67/51/21 for Pierpoint.

is probable that a number of the above considered revolt in October and actively worked against the regime or remained out of sight in the counties, it is clear that most of the next group were involved directly or indirectly in the rebellion. A number have already been introduced in various capacities as servants of Edward IV or prominent nobles, and associated through public and private service with the greater aristocracy. All of the following were excluded from the peace commissions directly after the rising. From Cornwall, Peter Tregouys and Edward Asshton of Callington; from Somerset John Biconell, William Hody, Sir William Paulet and Sir John Newton;⁶⁸ from Devon John Dennis and William Huddesfeld,⁶⁹ in Dorset, John Newburgh⁷⁰ and from Essex, John Green, (also Gloucestershire), Sir John Bourghier, John Wittell, Richard Lewes and Sir Richard Fitzlewis;⁷¹ from Gloucestershire, John Wikes, Thomas Baynam, John Huddleston and John Twynyho (Buckingham's servant and uncle of rebel William Twynyho);⁷² in Wiltshire, William Collingbourne (who, as noted, was imprisoned and executed in 1484) and John Benger; from Southampton, John Rogers, John Brocas and John Calowe;⁷³ in Oxfordshire, William Danvers and Walter Elmes;⁷⁴ in Berkshire, John Denton (also Buckinghamshire) and William Beselles; from Buckinghamshire, Sir John Donne, Thomas Tunstall and Thomas Fowler;⁷⁵ in Norfolk, Sir Edmund Bedingfield, Sir Tiro Robsert, James Hobart and Ralph

-
68. For Newton, *Wedgwood*, p. 631; Biconell and Hody have been mentioned throughout and were leading careerist lawyers in southern England; Sir William Paulet was the father of the rebel Amias Paulet. For Biconell, P.R.O.,C67/51/12; for Colshull, P.R.O.,C67/51/28.
69. Huddesfeld was closely associated with Sir John Crocker and John Biconell, two of his trustees: *Wedgwood*, pp. 475-6; for Dennis, P.R.O., C67/51/16.
70. Newburgh (1405-84) of East Lulworth, Dorset, took up public office in the 1420s as an elector in Dorset, graduating to the bench in the mid-1440s, he remained a J.P. until after the revolt in 1483; keeper of Povington in Dorset, he was an apportioner of the subsidy in Dorset in 1463 and keeper of the artillery in Caernarvon Castle, 1464-7. He had been associated with James, earl of Wiltshire: *Wedgwood*, p. 628; probably the father or uncle of Sir William, beheaded at Tewkesbury: P.R.O., C67/51/18.
71. *Wedgwood*, p. 334; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 559-60.
72. For Wykes or Wake, P.R.O.,C67/51/25; for Twynyho, P.R.O.,C67/51/10.
73. For Brocas and Rogers, *Wedgwood*, pp. 221, 721-2; Calowe, of Sydling, Dorset, was a local lawyer and a justice in Devon (and of the quorum) and Dorset as well as Hampshire also M.P. for Bridport, 1460-1: *Wedgwood*, p. 148.
74. Danvers was a member of the distinguished Oxfordshire Danvers who specialised in the law; Elmes, Stonor's cousin was also one of his 'men of affairs' and much of his correspondence with Sir William between 1478-1483 concerned the latter's Devonshire estates, money matters and questions concerning Stonor's wardship of the Fenns: *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, nos. 282, 287 and 288.

Willoughby; from Kent, Sir Henry Ferrers and John Alfegh;⁷⁶ excluded in Cambridgeshire, Thomas Cheyney, kinsman of Sir John of Fen Ditton, and Sir William Findern;⁷⁷ from Bedfordshire, John Fisher, William Colet and John Stamford; from Sussex, Richard Lewkenor the elder, Thomas Oxenbridge, John Stanney and John Dudley;⁷⁸ from Middlesex Sir John Elrington and finally, from Hertfordshire, John Sturgeon, William Druell and Thomas Rogers.⁷⁹

There is nothing significant in Huddleston's omission; the son of Sir John of Millom, Cumberland, one of Richard's knights of the body, he was associated with the new King before 1483, as was his younger brother Richard;⁸⁰ nor with Elrington's, who, created a knight of the body by Richard, died late in 1483. Again, others like Robsert were reinstated within weeks of their omission. While, perhaps, these cases raise question marks over the implications of such omissions, nevertheless, it is clear that a number of the above - again most of whom were 'of the household' as well as royal officials in the counties - were disaffected. Biconell and Hody, colleagues of Colshull and Hignons were also associates of lawyers Sir William Paulet of Dorset, (father of rebel, Amias Paulet) and William Huddesfeld, recorder in Exeter in 1479 and king's attorney 1477-83, who lost both offices after the rising. Both men, in turn, were intimates of Sir John Newton of Wyke in Yatton and Ubley, Somerset, who was knighted in 1471. On the bench in Somerset until 26 August, he was removed like the others after the revolt, and, until late 1485.⁸¹ Walter Elmes and Sir Richard Fitzlewis from Oxfordshire and Essex, respectively,

75. For Fowler, *Wedgwood*, p. 352. A stockfishmonger of London, Fowler was also an alderman of Oxford. Through his wife Alice Hulcote he had estates in Northamptonshire. He is listed as an esquire of the body in June 1483, but also a gentleman usher of the chamber in November, the position he had held under Edward IV. His omission was brief and he continued as a J.P. in Buckinghamshire and sheriff of Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire in November, 1483: P.R.O., E 404/78/2/8; his wife was John, Lord Dinham's sister, and had been a member of Elizabeth Woodville's household, see Pearse Chope, 'The Last of the Dinhams', *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, Vol. L (1918), p. 478; Myers, 'The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville', (Vol. LI), p. 452 and Leland, *op.cit.*, Vol. 5, p. 124.

76. For Willoughby, P.R.O., C67/51/28; for Ferrers, P.R.O., C67/51/27.

77. For Cheyney and Findern, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 555; *Wedgwood*, pp. 327-28.

78. For Oxenbridge, P.R.O., C67/51/5; for Dudley, P.R.O., C67/51/4. John Fisher was possibly a serjeant-at-law: C.I.P.M., no. 749.

79. For Sturgeon, P.R.O., C67/51/16.

80. For Sir John Huddleston, P.R.O., E 404/78/3/37; B.L. Cotton Julius B XII f. 241, and for Richard, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 369.

81. See above, notes 68, 69.

were kinsmen of Sir William Stonor, the former moving very much in Stonor's business circle from 1478. East Anglian Sir Henry Ferrers of Peckham, knighted at Tewkesbury, was sheriff of Kent from 13 May until 6 November. Prominent at Edward's funeral he too remained in eclipse under Richard like his associate Sir William Findern of Carlton; a colleague of, and trustee with, John Morton in 1478, he emerged after Richard's reign, becoming sheriff of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire in 1485, 'with 100 marks reward'.⁸²

Those removed after the rising in the Midlands and the North were Sir Thomas Ferrers from Warwickshire; Hugh Egerton, Richard Bagot, Sir John Ferrers of Tamworth and William Harper from Staffordshire; Roger Wake in Northamptonshire; Sir John Babington from Nottinghamshire; John Wake, John Clarevas and Robert Partfoil from Huntingdonshire; Thomas Meers from Lincolnshire (the parts of Holland); Richard Walcotes from Lincolnshire (the parts of Kesteven); Thomas Fitzwilliam and John Dymmock from Lincolnshire (the parts of Lindsey); Thomas Hord from Shropshire; Sir William Parre and Sir Thomas Broughton from Cumberland; William Brown from Rutlandshire; Sir Edmund Hastings, Sir Ralph Ashton, Sir Richard Scrope of Upsall, Sir Thomas Gower from Yorkshire (North Riding); William Savile, Sir Hugh Hastings, John Fitzwilliam, Sir Thomas Worteley, Sir John Neville and Edward Redman (West Riding); and finally Redman and Sir James Pickering in Westmorland.

Needless to say, some of the above like Yorkshiremen Sir Hugh Hastings (also of Norfolk), Sir John Babington, Ralph Ashton, Edward Redman and Lord Scrope assisted Richard III in suppressing the rising and were well repaid.⁸³ Yet others were implicated in the revolt including Staffordshire esquires Richard and John Bagot, father and son who were removed from all offices and Sir John Ferrers of Tamworth, Edward's knight of the body, and a nephew of Richard, Lord Hastings.⁸⁴ William Harper, Buckingham's servant, had also served Buckingham's uncle, the second husband of Margaret Beaufort, and is believed to have remained with Beaufort and Lord Stanley through much of 1484. Also connected with Beaufort, Thomas Horde of Shrewsbury and Walford, a lawyer and steward of Lord Strange (d. 1477),

⁸². See notes 74, 77. Sir Richard Fitzlewis was the grandson of Sir Lewis John by Margaret Stonor: *Wedgwood*, p. 334.

⁸³. Babington was Richard's knight of the body, and appointed sheriff in 1483: P.R.O., E 404/78/2/10; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 258; for Ashton, *ibid.*, pp. 199-200.

⁸⁴. For Bagot and Ferrers, *ibid.*, pp. 33, 318-19.

and a member for Bridgnorth was pardoned under Richard as 'late of Bridgnorth', Beaufort's residence in August-September, 1483.⁸⁵

There were yet others in the country who also left or lost court and county positions under Richard III. Among these are Sir James Crowmer of Tunstall, Kent, John Lye of Flamerston, Wiltshire, a member for Westbury and of the household from 1473-83, and William Middleton of Stoke, Sussex, who lost his position as gentleman usher of the Chamber in 1483, which he had held from 1479. From the Midlands, Warwickshire's Sir William Lucy of Charcotte, sheriff of Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire in 1468-9 and of Warwickshire and Leicestershire in 1474-5, held nothing under Richard; Sir Edmund Montfort of Warwickshire, whose rich political career began as a member of the king's household in 1444, and of Margaret of Anjou's from 1460-71, of whom nothing is known until his landing at Milford Haven in 1485 with Henry Tudor; in eclipse from Nottinghamshire, Sir Robert Strelley of Strelley and Bilborough and from Lincolnshire, John Moigne, gentleman of Willingham, a king's servant, made keeper of Dorchester and Portsmouth, 1 March 1483; Sir Ralph Hastings, knight of the body to Edward IV by 1474, and brother of William Lord Hastings; from the North, Sir John Middleton of Belsay, Northumberland, (kinsman of the above) a member of parliament from 1472-5, of the household from 1461 and a knight of the body in 1480-3 ; his associate in the county and at court, William Tyler, knighted on 7 August, 1485, and finally, James Morrisby of Windemere, Cumberland, the younger brother of Sir Christopher, who was a yeoman of the chamber 1476-83 and member of parliament for Cumberland in 1478, also went to ground under Richard.⁸⁶

What is most significant, however, is that not all who remained either in the household or on the bench after the rebellion had the King's confidence. It may be argued that Richard's sheriffs who took office in November 1483 were trusted officials - in the Midlands, Roger Wake (Northamptonshire), Thomas Wortley (Staffordshire) and Thomas Horde (Shropshire); in East Anglia and the South, Ralph Willoughby (Norfolk-Suffolk), John Wake (Cambridgeshire-Huntingdonshire), John Sturgeon (Essex-Hertfordshire), Thomas Fowler

⁸⁵. For Harper, P.R.O., C67/51/4; Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, pp. 205, 215-6; and for Harper allegedly in residence with Beaufort and Stanley, *Wedgwood*, p. 429. For Horde, *Wedgwood*, p. 468.

⁸⁶. For Lye (1442-1522), *Wedgwood*, p. 564; Middleton (1455-1505), *ibid.*, p. 592; Lucy (1436-92), *ibid.*, p. 560; Sir Edmund Montford, *ibid.*, p. 602; John Moigne (1455-1503/6), *ibid.*, p. 598; for Ralph Hastings of Harrowden, Northamptonshire, Wanstead, Essex and Kirby, Leicestershire, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 371; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 440; for Sir John Middleton (1440-1503) of Belsay, Northumberland, *Wedgwood*, p. 591; James Morrisby (1445-1508/9), *ibid.*, p. 611.

(Bedfordshire-Buckinghamshire), and John Barantyne (Oxfordshire-Berkshire). Equally, however, it could be argued that Richard had no choice but to appoint gentry from the Midlands and particularly the South, Horde, Fowler, Barantyne, Willoughby and more whose kin and colleagues were part of the early groundswell against him, and some of whom themselves had lost offices earlier in the reign. With, at a conservative estimate, around forty percent of the leading gentry either abroad or in hiding, the King had little alternative but to call on those gentry available whose expertise was essential for the maintenance of the country.⁸⁷

Again, with some of Richard's knights and esquires of the body and lesser officials, it is difficult to assess his policy as one of appeasement or sheer necessity. Having lost a good proportion of his brother's men, and mindful of the need to win back some ground yet also entrench his own position, his choices doubtless caused unease; even with men such as John Babington, a Hastings retainer who became a knight of the body at Richard's coronation, yet received no further patronage;⁸⁸ and Hastings's brother, Sir Ralph who remained a knight of the body. Likewise, Sir John Ferrers, Hastings's nephew, who as noted, lost his Staffordshire commission after the rising, was confirmed as king's knight, yet had to pledge himself to remain in London in August, 1484;⁸⁹ again Thomas Fowler dropped from the commission in Buckinghamshire, who remained an esquire of the body under Richard, was allegedly with Henry Tudor at Bosworth;⁹⁰ John Sturgeon of Heytesbury and Hitchin, replaced in Hertfordshire, and an usher of the chamber and an esquire of the body to Edward IV by 1481, kept this position under Richard,⁹¹ as did his colleagues Robert Radcliffe, a Woodville associate and Robert Pemberton, off all commissions yet an usher of the chamber. Thomas Wintershulle lost his Surrey commission yet remained as serjeant of the herthounds, and Thomas Roger esquire, like his kinsman, John Roger, lost his Hertfordshire place, but remained under Richard as clerk of the king's ships.⁹² Most surprising is yeoman of the crown Robert Brent of Wivlesburgh, Kent, formerly of Edward's household and indicted after the rising, who

87. For Roger Wake, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/6; Wortley, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/7; Horde, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/22; Ralph Willoughby, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/14; John Wake, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/19; Sturgeon, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/9; Fowler, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/8 and Barantyne, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/13.

88. For Babington, P.R.O., E 404/78/2/10; *Wedgwood*, p. 118.

89. C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1317.

90. C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 96; C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 411.

91. *Ibid.*, p. 264; Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 593; *Wedgwood*, pp. 825-6.

92. For Thomas Roger, P.R.O., E 404/78/3/29; for Wintershulle, R. Horrox, 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', Appendix II.

was confirmed in his position in 1484 yet lost a number of his offices including verger of Sandwich.⁹³ Finally, some who remained on the bench also made Richard uneasy like Charles Dinham, (younger brother of John, Lord Dinham) Richard's esquire of the body, who was buccaneering off Brittany in November, 1483.⁹⁴

Thus far the discussion has centered on the possible and probable disaffection of the gentry, both within the South and further afield. With a thorough assessment of those directly involved in the rising, and many others implicated, attention must now focus on the nobles. Given the number of leading knights and esquires involved in 'Buckingham's rebellion' it is not unreasonable to assume that a number of nobles from the South and elsewhere were also disaffected, some of whom managed to pull back from direct action as the rising crumbled. This, in fact, is supported by evidence from the peace commissions which indicate the replacement of a number of lords on the bench, and again highlights the nervousness of the crown at this time. Two nobles who were clearly disaffected are John, Lord Audley and William Berkeley, earl of Nottingham. After years of service, Audley, kinsman of rebel Thomas Audley, lost commissions directly after the revolt in Surrey, Dorset, Hampshire, Wiltshire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire and Shropshire. Shortly after on 29 December 1483 Audley was issued with a general pardon.⁹⁵ Nottingham, a kinsman of the rebel, Sir William Berkeley, was replaced on the bench in Norfolk, Nottinghamshire and Gloucestershire. In the latter he was appointed in July 1483, replaced after September and not reappointed until March 1484. In addition Nottingham was pardoned in December 1484 'of all offences committed by him before 16 November last'. Both the latter and Audley bound 'unto to the king', in £10,000 and £5,000 respectively, were obliged to make over to Richard substantial lands in South Wales, the Midlands and the South.⁹⁶ Thomas West, Lord Lawarre was omitted in Southampton and Sussex. Sir Richard Fiennes, Lord Dacre, father of rebel Thomas Fiennes esquire, lost commissions in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, Suffolk (in the latter in December, 1483), Lincolnshire, the parts of Kesteven (yet remained on the bench for the parts of Holland, and Lindsey), Worcestershire and Herefordshire. Margaret Beaufort's husband, Lord Stanley, imprisoned briefly in June for his part with Lord Hastings lost his Surrey commission along with Reginald, Lord Grey of Wilton in Kent. Others are more difficult to gauge such as the loss of commissions to the aged earls of Kent and Essex, the latter being replaced in Suffolk and Essex after February 1483, the former in Buckinghamshire after February; likewise, Edward Grey, Lord Lisle was omitted in Devon from May, 1483, but remained on the Gloucestershire bench. Yet the crown took direct action against Robert, Lord

93. *Ibid.*

94. *Wedgwood*, p. 275.

95. *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 415.

96. *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, nos. 1218, 1263, 1347, 1353.

Poynings, whose kinsman Edward was attainted in Kent, by indicting him soon after the rising.
97

An analysis of the pardon rolls from February - July 1484 supports the notion that a proportion of the nobility might well have been implicated in the revolt; it certainly indicates that many more than the 'known' rebels were involved. The pardons present problems however. The significance of grants of pardon at periods of crisis is difficult to assess; while many rebels petitioned for pardon, so did others who were clearly firm adherents to the regime. Yet the pardon rolls are of interest because they indicate the categories of people either who sought overtly to stay onside with the crown, or who sought to regain their former standing after the event. Importantly, the pardons help bring home the significance of the rising as viewed by the recipients, and undoubtedly, the crown. Many categories of people sought pardons early in 1484: nobles, knights, esquires and gentlemen (and some of their womenfolk) as well as an array of merchants, yeomen, husbandmen and tradespeople; members of the royal household; officials and bureaucrats at Westminster as well as those who ran the crown's estates - stewards, receivers, auditors and escheators together with lesser officials who worked in the ports and towns; servants of the aristocracy - both household and estate officials, as well as groups from religious institutions. It is clear from the pardon rolls that these groups either were under suspicion (real or imagined) by the crown, or felt they could be implicated by enemies, or, given the size of the rising felt it wise to petition and indemnify themselves as a precaution. While the majority of pardons are from the South, the common factor uniting the petitioners - North and South - is service to Edward IV.

From 1 February to 31 July 1484 around 1100 men and women petitioned for pardon; a large number of these were connected with 'Buckingham's rebellion'. Some had already been pardoned by 31 December 1483 : Lord Audley, the dean of Exeter, John Arundel, Sir Thomas Bourghier, Robert Skern of Surrey and more, some of whom received a second pardon in 1484.⁹⁸ The commissions instituted in the counties after the rebellion - at Bodmin and Torrington, Southampton, Kent and elsewhere unearthed most of the leaders who were attainted in January 1484; they also uncovered many others who escaped attainder, as noted. Alongside his lieutenants such as Lord Scrope, the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Surrey, Richard III also had a hand in this process. In Sir Thomas Lewkenor's petition for pardon in 1484, he talks of 'most sorrowful and repentant subjects whose names be marked with...' Richard's 'own gracious hand in the book of exception delivered to Master Chaterton to grant to all them whose names ensue your gracious letters of pardon...' Inclusion in the 'book of exception' did not mean an

97. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 40.

98. *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 369, 372, 375, 412-3, 415.

official reprieve 'as the said book can be no sufficient warrant to make out their pardon...'Clearly, however, it was a basis for later action.⁹⁹

Between February and July 1484, fifteen lords are recorded on the rolls, some of whom lost peace commissions after the rising; from the South, William Berkeley, earl of Nottingham (10 March, also December 1484), Thomas Arundel, Lord Maltravers (March), William, earl of Arundel (February), John, duke of Norfolk (February) and his son, the earl of Surrey (March), the duke of Suffolk (27 February), George Neville, Lord Bergavenny (23 February), John, Lord Stourton (23 February) and Thomas West, Lord Lawarre (20 March); from the Midlands and the North, John Tuchet, Lord Audley (25 February), Edward Grey, Lord Lisle, John Sutton, Lord Dudley (11 March), Thomas, Lord Stanley (27 February), Edward, Lord Hastings (March) and Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland (March).¹⁰⁰ While Audley and Stanley were probably disaffected, Lisle and Berkeley undecided, others such as Norfolk, Surrey and Suffolk, the King's brother-in-law, seemed fully committed to the new regime. While much time could be spent analysing the motives behind the pardons, the common link between all the above was their affinity with, and service to, the former King. All had worked in various capacities in the counties and most had held offices at court. 'Buckingham's rebellion' was widely perceived - both at court and in the country - as a rebellion of Edward IV's servants against Richard III. Not a rising in favour of Henry Tudor - although he became the focus of the disaffected, but a groundswell of opposition from all ranks who had served Edward and which made obligatory, for the rest, the acquisition of a pardon.

This argument is brought home forcefully by a study of the knights, esquires and gentlemen who obtained pardons after the revolt; royal servants who now saw themselves as belonging to 'high risk' groups.¹⁰¹ Forty-one knights are named - twenty from the South and twenty-one from the North and the Midlands;¹⁰² a breakdown of the former reveals the following: four were indicted, although not attainted, in the centres of revolt: Thomas Fulford, John Crocker,

⁹⁹. P.R.O., C81/1531/48; see also C. Richmond, '1485 and all that, or just what was going on at the Battle of Bosworth?', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law* (London, 1986), pp. 198-9.

¹⁰⁰. C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 500; for Dudley, P.R.O., C67/51/3; for the earl of Arundel and Lord Maltravers, P.R.O., C67/51/2; duke of Norfolk, P.R.O., C67/51/11; Lisle, P.R.O., C67/51/35; Surrey, P.R.O., C67/51/17; Northumberland, P.R.O., C67/51/16; Suffolk, P.R.O., C67/51/13; Stanley, P.R.O., C67/51/14.

¹⁰¹. While it is impossible to assess the number of pardons connected with 'Buckingham's rebellion', it seems reasonable to assume that after such a revolt involving around 40 percent of the leading gentry, that a solid proportion issued from the event.

¹⁰². See Appendix 5.

William Haute and Thomas Bourgchier, senior. Most others had close kin either attainted or indicted: Philip and William Courtenay, Sir Richard Harcourt and John Heveningham. Among those who lost peace commissions and remained off the bench (excluding the named rebels) : Sir Edmund Rede (Buckinghamshire- May), John Heveningham (Suffolk, May), Henry Rose (Sussex, June); Henry Ferrers (Kent - October). Of those from the Midlands and the North, only one, Sir John Bourgchier of Leicestershire, Warwickshire and Essex, was allegedly a rebel.¹⁰³ Again, only one was dropped from the peace commissions, Sir Henry Pierpoint from Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.¹⁰⁴ The omission from the pardon rolls of a number of those left off the bench during Richard's reign - men who had served Edward in the counties and at court - confirms the suspicion that a substantial number of knights from the Midlands and the north, lay low during Richard's reign not even emerging for pardon. On the other hand the pardons reinforce the point that leading county and household knights who remained in service, and had been prominent under Edward petitioned for pardon. Almost all had been (and a number still were) of the household, had recently been or were sheriffs, and remained (as noted) on the bench.

The group includes six knights of the body under Edward IV: Thomas Bourgchier, Richard Croft, Thomas Montgomery, Thomas Burgh, John Grisley and Charles Pilkington; two were king's knights: John Savage and William Stanley; Richard Harcourt had been a king's esquire; Henry Ferrers, Roger Kynaston and Edmund Rede, king's servants; William Haute, king's servitor and Gilbert Debenham, king's carver; Thomas Thwaites had served abroad in Calais as king's emissary; Thomas Burgh was privy councillor to Edward; Humphrey Starky, chief baron of the exchequer; Richard Croft, treasurer of the household of the Prince of Wales; Sir Thomas Bourgchier, 'king's kinsman' in 1464 and marshal of the marshalsea from the 1460s. Despite their court connections, the strongest link between the knights was their service to the former King in the counties. Of the southern knights who obtained pardons, all, but one, Sir William Boleyn, had administered the shires as peace commissioners, sheriffs, stewards, constables, keepers and escheators; many like Bourgchier, Croft, Harcourt and Rede, were on the bench and active as sheriffs as well as holding numerous offices in royal estate-management in the shires under Edward. This was the case with those from the Midlands and the North, almost all of whom had served Edward in various capacities in the counties.¹⁰⁵

103. Bourgchier (Burster) was included in Vergil's list of refugees in Brittany. However his name only appears in some erroneous translations of Vergil. Bourgchier was pardoned on 8 May, see P.R.O.,C67/51/15.

104. For Pierpoint, pardoned 26 April, P.R.O., C67/51/21.

105. For the following information see Appendix 3.

The same applies to the vast majority of the 160 esquires recorded on the rolls for the period. Just over two-thirds of these were from the South (99), with the largest proportion from the West Country (41). The esquires include the well-connected such as Thomas Audley, brother of John Tuchet, Lord Audley, James and Thomas Blount, kinsmen of Lord Mountjoy and Jacob and Bartholomew St Leger; legal careerists such as John Fineux, John Mompesson, Thomas Lygon and John Biconell; royal auditors and stewards like John Walsh, William Harper and Jacques Blondel; and wealthy merchants such as Anthony Brown, Christopher Colyns a London draper, Peter Peckham and John Tame, merchant of the staple of Calias. Some were king's esquires under Edward such as Hertfordshire's John Sturgeon and John Luthington; a number of others were esquires of the body like John Wikes of Gloucestershire, Edward Brampton of London, Colyns above-mentioned, John Risley of Suffolk, James Haute, John Hugford and John Fortescue.¹⁰⁶ Many others had also held household positions such as gentleman ushers, Thomas Fowler and Edward Hardgill, yeoman of the chamber, John Penley, yeomen of the crown, Avery Cornburgh and John Lewes and king's servants, Thomas Audley, Richard Brone, John Brocas and Thomas Croft.¹⁰⁷ Some held important bureaucratic posts such as John Wood of Molesey, Surrey (brother of Sir John) who was keeper of the coinage and warden of the mint; others served in a legal capacity such as Thomas Lygon, solicitor for the King, or as ambassadors abroad, such as Brampton (above-mentioned) ambassador to Portugal.¹⁰⁸

A number of the esquires who obtained pardons were listed as rebels in the sectors of revolt, and/or had close kinsmen who rebelled: Thomas Audley, Edward Berkeley, John and William Twynyho, Edward and William Wingfield, John Wood, Anthony Brown, Richard Culpepper, Constantine and Edward Darell, James Haute, Humphrey and Robert Poyntz and Jacob and Bartholomew St Leger. Others had been implicated well before the rising such as John Forster, or were disaffected through 1484 such as James and Thomas Blount, John Fortescue and John Risley. Many others had lost peace commissions after the rising: from Berkshire, William Beselles; from Dorset, John Biconell; from Devon, John Sapcote; from Gloucestershire Buckingham's servants, John Twynyho and John Weeks (above-mentioned); Southampton, John Brocas; Oxfordshire, Thomas Croft; Sussex, John Dudley; Buckinghamshire, Thomas Fowler; Cambridgeshire, Henry Langley; Norfolk, Ralph Willoughby; Hertfordshire, John Sturgeon,

106. For Wikes, P.R.O., C67/51/25; Sturgeon, P.R.O., C67/51/16; Luthington, P.R.O., C67/51/7; Brampton, P.R.O., C67/51/18; Colyns, P.R.O., C67/51/9; Risley, P.R.O., C67/51/13; Haute, P.R.O., C67/51/30; Hugford, P.R.O., C67/51/28; Fortescue, P.R.O., C67/51/10.

107. For Fowler, P.R.O., C67/51/20; Hardgill, P.R.O., C67/51/14; Penley, P.R.O., C67/51/37; Avery Cornburgh, *Wedgwood*, p. 223; John Lewes, P.R.O., C67/51/10; Thomas Audley, P.R.O., C67/51/1; Richard Bronde, P.R.O., C67/51/5; John Brocas, P.R.O., C67/51/16; Croft, P.R.O., C67/51/7.

108. For Wood, P.R.O., C67/51/16; Lygon, P.R.O., C67/51/9; Brampton, P.R.O., C67/51/18.

William Druell and John Forster (above-mentioned); Huntingdonshire John Wake; from Staffordshire, Buckingham's servant William Harper, and in Northamptonshire, Robert Pemberton.¹⁰⁹ Yet again, while many were implicated directly or indirectly in the rising, the common factor among the recipients was their service to Edward IV at court, and more especially in the counties. At the very least, 120 of the esquires recorded on the rolls had served as peace commissioners, sheriffs, escheators, customers and the like. A breakdown of this figure includes thirty one justices of the peace, thirty sheriffs, twelve escheators and twenty-four customers.¹¹⁰

To an important degree, this was also the trend among the 198 gentlemen who took out pardons, 149 of whom were from the South and of those, sixty-two from West Country.¹¹¹ As with the esquires, a number of gentlemen had important connections, among them James Audley, Thomas Brandon, Reginald Bray, Peter Curtis and Richard and Robert Morton;¹¹² a number had held household and bureaucratic posts under Edward such as John Timperley, esquire of the body, Curtis, keeper of the great wardrobe, John Bell, cofferer of the household, John Fitzherbert, king's remembrancer, Robert Forster, king's stationer, John Lee, yeoman of the crown and John Smyth, yeoman of the chamber;¹¹³ some were royal receivers and stewards such as John Hayes, William Knolles and Nicholas Lowe; others were leading lawyers or wealthy merchants including John Fineux of Faversham, Kent, Edmund Jenney, Morgan Kidwelly, Thomas Kebell and John Brown, recently alderman of London, John Wade and merchant of the staple, John Lemmington;¹¹⁴ a number were servants of the aristocracy such as Reginald Bray and John Horde in service to Margaret Beaufort; Richard Harper, John Kymer, John Flasby and William Strode, servants of the late duke of Buckingham (the latter with John Forster, above-mentioned, servant as well of the late Lord Hastings).¹¹⁵

109. For loss of peace commissions see above.

110. For the above information see Appendix 4.

111. *Ibid.*

112. For Audley, P.R.O., C67/51/1; Brandon, P.R.O., C67/51/14; Bray, P.R.O., C67/51/11; Curtis, P.R.O., C67/51/6; Richard and Robert Morton, P.R.O., C67/51/3 and P.R.O., C67/51/10.

113. For Timperley, P.R.O., C67/51/10; Curtis, P.R.O., C67/51/6; Bell, P.R.O., C67/51/7; Fitzherbert, P.R.O., C67/51/16; Forster, P.R.O., C67/51/11; Lee, P.R.O., C67/51/19; Smyth, P.R.O., C67/51/25.

114. For Hayes, P.R.O., C67/51/34; Knowles, P.R.O., C67/51/27; Lowe, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Fineux, P.R.O., C67/51/12; Jenney, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Kidwelly, P.R.O., C67/51/15; Kebell, P.R.O., C67/51/21 and P.R.O., C67/51/27; Brown, P.R.O., C67/51/17; Wade, P.R.O., C67/51/5; Lemington, P.R.O., C67/51/5.

115. For Strode, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 191.

From among this group, gentlemen Thomas Brandon, Alexander Cheyney, John Isley, John Heron, William Strode and Robert Brent had been attainted; Reginald Bray, Peter Curtis and Stephen Calmady were clearly implicated along with both Browns of London, kinsmen of Sir George Brown executed in October, and perhaps Nicholas Halwell, brother of attainted rebel, John Halwell of Bigbury, Devon.¹¹⁶ Yet as with the other groups the pardons are not primarily a roll-call of the disaffected (although there was a substantial number included). Again, service to Edward IV was the common denominator. At a conservative estimate, almost half the group had served the dead King, some at court, most in the counties; occasionally as justices of the peace or sheriffs, but most commonly as customers, collectors, bailiffs and the like in the ports and on the land.

To a lesser degree and in a reduced capacity, service to Edward was prevalent among two other groups - 139 merchants and fifty-seven without a designation. Thirty-one of these had been in service mainly as collectors in the ports under the King.¹¹⁷ Only one of the group, John Norris, brother of attainted rebel Sir William of Berkshire, was listed as a rebel, though others such as Jacob Morton and Henry Colet (an intimate of Reginald Bray), might well have been involved.¹¹⁸ The merchants like the knights, esquires and gentlemen, were very much a 'high risk' group, many of whom (along with gentlemen such as John Flasby and John Kymer) were customers with free access to the ports and towns involved in the revolt. In fact given the role played by West Country merchants in ferrying the rebels to Brittany, it was, no doubt, necessary for these men to secure a pardon as insurance against penalty. One of the 'merchant' petitioners, William Caxton, best known for the printing press which he opened at Westminster in 1476, frequently tapped the Low Countries for technological expertise and business acumen. Unlike others, however, Caxton's desire for 'protection' almost certainly stemmed from his ties with his cultivated and pious patron, the late Earl Rivers and his circle, rather than fear over possible mercantile misdemeanours.¹¹⁹

None of the largest 'high risk' group composed of 203 yeomen and husbandmen was in service to Edward IV, but their implication in the rising is evident from the pardon rolls. These were the tenants and servants of the aristocracy, the rank and file of the rising whose address, not always, but often, signalled their revolt: Thomas Ludgate, John Waryn and William Capton from Fulford, Devon, the seat of rebel Sir Thomas Fulford; Peter Waterman and Thomas

116. For Brandon, Cheyney, Isley, Heron, Strode and Brent, see Appendix 4.

117. These were the men with 'discoverable' connections with the former King; doubtless many more were minor officials in the ports and towns.

118. For Colet, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 47 and *Wedgwood*, p. 205.

119. P.R.O., C67/51/35.

and John Cadlott of Rolvenden, Kent, John and Richard Guildford's main seat; Roger Jones of Cokeham, and John Flyntt of Cokeham and Yattendon, Berkshire, (two of William Norris's seats) the former also from Dartford, Kent along with William Waymer; John Donne of Morton, Dorset, a seat of Robert and Richard Morton; John Shank, capper of Cricklade, a Hungerford seat; John Daseley, Benedict and John Davy, yeomen of Cothele, seat of rebel Richard Nanfan; William Hill of Gaynesford, Kent, seat of rebels John and William Gaynesford and John Brinckwell of Bromham, Wiltshire, the main seat of Sir Roger Tocotes. Some of the yeoman were from Stafford estates frequented by the late duke of Buckingham such as John Affane of Tonbridge, Kent and John Brette of Writtle, Essex.¹²⁰

Other connections between and within the groups are clear: gentlemen Richard Bedell was also from Writtle and Richard Forde from Penshurst, the late duke's Kent seat.¹²¹ John Denton's Berkshire address was Witham, shared by Sir Richard Harcourt; John Hays, a royal reciever and auditor, gave his residence as Tiverton, Edward Courtenay's seat; gentlemen George Bainbridge was 'recently' from Trotton, Sussex, the seat of Sir Thomas Lewkenor, while John Brode and John Isley were both of Sunridge, Kent; William Head came from Marsden, formerly in Elizabeth Woodville's gift and run by Sir George Brown; John Helsham's address was both Sir Alexander Culpepper's seat of Goudhurst and the Guildford's seat, Rolvenden, while esquires James Frampton and John Marvin were from Morton, Dorset, and Heytesbury, Wiltshire (the Hungerford's main Wiltshire seat) respectively. Another, Stephen Wayte was also of Goodhurst, Kent, Culpepper's estate.¹²² What is also evident from the rolls is that a number of rebels had grouped at various centres to orchestrate their part in the plot: in Somerset, rebels John Heron and William Brent, with John Baker and others gathered at Heron's seat of Lamport Estoner; rebels Alexander Cheyney and John Norris along with John Kentwood met at Westshifford, Berkshire; Thomas Brandon of Southwark, Surrey, was joined by lawyer, Benedict Caldwell, also of Ipswich, near the Brandons' main Suffolk seat, and

120. For Ludgard, P.R.O., C67/51/2; Waryn, P.R.O., C67/51/5; Capton, P.R.O., C67/51/5; Waterman, P.R.O., C67/51/9; for Thomas and John Cadlott, P.R.O., C67/51/5; Jones, P.R.O., C67/51/18; Flyntt, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Waymer, P.R.O., C67/51/8; Donne, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Shank, P.R.O., C67/51/23; Daseley, P.R.O., C67/51/25; Benedict, P.R.O., C67/51/2; Davy, P.R.O., C67/51/27; William Hill, P.R.O., C67/51/17; Brinckwell, P.R.O., C67/51/29; Affane, P.R.O., C67/51/15; Brette, P.R.O., C67/51/21.

121. Bedell, P.R.O., C67/51/5; Forde, P.R.O., C67/51/23.

122. For Denton, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Hays, P.R.O., C67/51/33; Bainbridge, P.R.O., C67/51/23; Brode, P.R.O., C67/51/27; Isley, P.R.O., C67/51/23; Head, P.R.O., C67/51/27; Helsham, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Frampton, P.R.O., C67/51/23; Marvin, P.R.O., C67/51/26; Wayte, P.R.O., C67/51/10.

gentleman, Thomas Milbery.¹²³ Yet again others were from the main centres of revolt or trouble spots which worried Richard for weeks: From Exeter for example were esquires Thomas Beaumont, Thomas Calwoodley and Henry Hull; in Kent John Simon was from Canterbury, as were esquires, Robert Halley, John Rotherham, William Gibbon, and William Hille. Others are listed as of Maidstone, Rochester and Dartford.¹²⁴

As the discussion has demonstrated, the servants of Edward IV who petitioned for pardon after the rising, comprised a vast cross-section of men - many of whom played a part in the revolt. 'Buckingham's rebellion' cut across the lines of society exposing whole communities from yeomen to knights and nobles. The knights and esquires serving as peace commissioners and sheriffs, wielded enormous power and influence in the regions; with access to royal and aristocratic estates through their positions in estate-management, they were able to reach large sections of the populace as the leaders of local society. The gentlemen, a number of whom were lawyers in noble households, escheators for the crown, or wealthy merchants and collectors of royal taxes in the ports and on the land, were able to disseminate information around a wide circuit, from Kent to Cornwall and beyond. The yeomen, in turn, also played a part; their itineracy facilitating the rapid spread of information through the various regions. Nowhere is this cross-section more evident than in the West Country where 189 pardons comprised five knights, forty-one esquires, sixty gentlemen, twenty merchants and fifty-three yeomen (ten with no designation).

The church also played a significant role in the rebellion. The pardon rolls indicate petitions from 172 religious groups or individuals. As with the rest, the largest portion - fifty petitions - came from the South West, most particularly Wiltshire, Hampshire and Gloucestershire. Clearly ecclesiastics felt vulnerable after the revolt. Churches and their grounds offered temporary sanctuary rights which could be extended for an indefinite period incorporating more than the actual consecrated ground. Their attractions are obvious after the rebellion, and a survey of the rolls shows identifiable trends indicating implication if not involvement.¹²⁵ A number of the petitioners can be linked with centres of revolt: Alan Breytoft, vicar and John Breytoft, clerk, along with George Tourton, chaplain, were all of Tonbridge,

¹²³. For Heron, P.R.O., C67/51/8; Brent, P.R.O., C67/51/15; Baker, P.R.O., C67/51/15; for Cheyney, P.R.O., C67/51/6; Norris, P.R.O., C67/51/15; Kentwood, P.R.O., C67/51/26; Brandon, P.R.O., C67/51/14; Caldwell, P.R.O., C67/51/5; Milbery, P.R.O., C67/51/21.

¹²⁴. For Beaumont, P.R.O., C67/51/24; Calwoodley, P.R.O., C67/51/10; Hull, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Simon, P.R.O., C67/51/10; Halley, P.R.O., C67/51/18; Rotherham, P.R.O., C67/51/20; Gibbon, P.R.O., C67/51/20.

¹²⁵. V.C.H., Hampshire, Vol. 2, p. 143.

Kent; Roger Dinham master of the hospital of John Evangelist, came from Canterbury; David Hopton was archdeacon of Exeter, John Williams, prior at Bodmin, Cornwall and Thomas Nende, abbot of Kyngeswood, Gloucestershire and of Beaulieu, Southampton.¹²⁶ Others can be linked with specific families such as David Berkeley, prior of the church of Peter and Paul, Plympton, Devon; William Berkeley, abbot of Mary of Flaxley, Hereford; John Bourghier, archdeacon of Canterbury; Thomas Brent, deacon of the parish church of South Malling, Sussex and of Charing, Kent, and a member of the Brewes family, deacon of Bangor, recently of Westbury, Gloucestershire and Soham Court, Cambridgeshire.¹²⁷

The many petitions from Gloucestershire, Wiltshire and Hampshire indicate the significance of the region both before and after the revolt and shed light on the nature of the rising in the South West.¹²⁸ The area, in fact, had played a major role in currying sedition, the focus of which was Lionel Woodville at Buckingham's residence of Thornbury. Robert Morton (kinsman of the bishop of Ely), archdeacon of Gloucester was dismissed from his Westminster post on 23 September, the same day as Woodville lost his temporalities.¹²⁹ His colleague, Henry Dene, prior of the monastery of Lanthony, Gloucestershire, (who had enjoyed a warm relationship with the late King) obtained his pardon on 26 February as did Richard Chyne, abbot of St Mary, Cirencester, and later the deacons and canons of the cathedral church there.¹³⁰ Quite possibly they had offered sanctuary to rebels in late October like the abbey of Beaulieu, with its franchise, 'as it is said...as large as the franchise of Westminster'.¹³¹ Indeed the abbey had played a key role after the rising sheltering rebels Robert Poyntz and

126. For the Breytofts, P.R.O., C67/51/20; Tourton, P.R.O., C67/51/21; Dinham, P.R.O., C67/51/27; Hopton, P.R.O., C67/51/20; Hopton was almost certainly involved in the rebellion, see *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 102; Williams, P.R.O., C67/51/2; Nende, P.R.O., C67/51/29.

127. For David Berkeley, P.R.O., C67/51/12; William Berkeley, P.R.O., C67/51/35; John Bourghier, P.R.O., C67/51/28; Brent, P.R.O., C67/51/27; Brewes, P.R.O., C67/51/26.

128. The significance of the West Country in 'Buckingham's rebellion' will be discussed in Part 3.

129. See G. Waters, 'Morton connections in Gloucester', *The Ricardian*, Vol. III, No. 46 (1974), p. 17; 'The will and Inventory of Robert Morton, A.D., 1486-1488', ed. E. M. Thompson, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, Vol. XXXIII (1877), p. 308.

130. For Henry Dene, see 'The Will of Henry Dene, Archbishop of Canterbury, Deceased 15 February, 1502-3', *Archaeological Journal*, Vol. XVIII (1861), pp. 256-7 Dene apparently owed his preferment to John Morton, see *ibid.*, p. 258.

131. *Arrivall*, p. 22.

Lionel Woodville.¹³² Its significance did not escape Richard who stopped off there in November 1483, on his way to London following his success in the West.¹³³ The abbey remained a thorn in his side through the following months. On 15 December 1483, Thomas Nende was summoned to Westminster by the King to set before him those documents which gave the abbey its sanctuary rights. Clearly Nende was able to plead his case successfully, as Woodville remained there for some months.¹³⁴

Three of the most interesting pardons were secured by Thomas Rotherham, archbishop of York, John Russell, bishop of Lincoln - past and present chancellors and keepers of the privy seal - and Oliver King, canon of the collegiate church of Mary of Southwell, and Edward IV's secretary.¹³⁵ While the pardons present numerous possibilities and probabilities in terms of disaffection, all three, probably disenchanted with Richard, were themselves under suspicion. Rotherham had been imprisoned for a time with King and Lord Stanley after Hastings's death on 13 June. Deprived of the great seal, he was replaced by Russell as Richard's chancellor. Yet nor was Russell trusted. Richard again recalled the great seal as soon as the rising broke. In view of the revolt of Edward IV's servants, the crown viewed the loyalty of men like Rotherham, King and especially Russell - as suspect. All three had been true and trusted servants of Edward IV; after his death and before the disappearance of the Princes, all three had served the Prince of Wales. Richard's insecurity, the product of his brother's servants, was ongoing - compounded by those loyal to his nephew.

132. For Poyntz, P.R.O., C67/51/10; for Woodville, H. E. Salter, 'Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1483-1531', *Oxford Historical Society*, Vol. LXXVI (1921), p. 41; Thomson, 'Bishop Lionel Woodville and Richard III', p. 134. Woodville was dead by 1 December, 1484: *ibid.*, p. 135.

133. This information is provided by Richmond, '1485 and all that, or just what was going on at the Battle of Bosworth?', pp. 198-9.

134. Thomson, 'Bishop Lionel Woodville and Richard III', p. 134. Beaulieu was conveniently situated on an inlet to the sea and no doubt facilitated speedy access to an escape route for the rebels: *V.C.H., Hampshire*, Vol. 3, p. 143.

135. For Rotherham, P.R.O., C67/51/6; Russell, P.R.O., C67/51/6; King, P.R.O., C67/51/7.

PART 3

SOUTHERN ENGLAND IN THE YORKIST POLITY

CHAPTER 6

THE REGIONS IN REVOLT, 1461-83

From the late 1450s all regions in southern England were involved - in varying degrees - in the intermittent struggles between the crown and the disaffected. There are discernible patterns, however, in the commitment of certain regions, or in the ability of lords to harness support there at strategic times. The West Country, particularly, played a pivotal role. It was in the West that forces were mobilized for the crown in 1459-60, and against the King from 1461 - 1464, and in 1469-71. Counties including Somerset, Devon, Dorset, Wiltshire, Hampshire and Gloucestershire possessed strategic castles, towns and ports - Exeter, Tewkesbury, Salisbury, Southampton, Weymouth, Poole, Dartmouth and Plymouth; in addition, ecclesiastical houses such as the Benedictine abbey of Cerne in Dorset and Beaulieu, Hampshire, with their franchises and lay holdings, were often the foci of dissident forces who both rallied support and took respite within their walls. Conversely in the Central South, Oxfordshire and Berkshire, royal counties with their great honours long since absorbed by the crown, for the most part supported the ruling house during conflict. Again, between 1459-61 the South East, particularly Kent, was one of the stamping grounds of the duke of York, his son, Edward earl of March, the earl of Warwick, Earl Rivers and others. The English garrison at Calais, at this time controlled by Warwick, was a base from which 'Yorkist' lords could cross into England either to Sandwich or Dover in Kent or to one of the Cinque ports. Ten years later, however, when dissident forces opposed the crown, parts of Kent and Sussex again arrayed for Warwick, this time against Edward IV.

In some areas few men between sixteen and sixty were unaffected by the sporadic conflict from the late 1450s to the early 1470s: as inhabitants of ports or inland towns through which forces marched, as men locally conscripted as servants or tenants of dissident lords, or more formally for the crown through commissions of array; as active participants in the fighting, and occasionally by expressing their own opinions through civil unrest - and paying the price. The strategic ports in the South East and South West perhaps witnessed most of the action. In Kent men from the Cinque ports mustered for Edward earl of March in 1460, joining him at Southampton;¹ while a contingent from Sandwich joined the earls of Salisbury and Warwick when they landed there on 20 June 1460 from Calais. In mid-summer 1469, when Warwick, this time in league with the duke of Clarence and in the 'Lancastrian' interest again landed at Sandwich from Calais he was joined by local levies from here and nearby Canterbury. In the spring of 1470, Warwick assured of 'friends' in Kent circulated a manifesto denouncing Edward

¹. V.C.H., Sussex, Vol. 9, p. 40; H.M.C., Report V, pp. 490-1.

IV's government and urging the 'commons' to array at Canterbury. Certainly the 'commons' had assembled by 18 July when the earl of Oxford wrote to John Paston requesting 'iii horse harnesses'.² Shortly after, Warwick's cousin Thomas Neville, Bastard of Fauconberg made a diversion in the straits of Dover as a cover, while the earl himself landed not at Sandwich but at Dartmouth in Devon. After Warwick's death Fauconberg again converged on Sandwich with his fleet on 12 May 1471, having recruited from Calais and the Cinque Ports as well as Surrey and Essex, and most particularly, Kent.³ Marching to London Fauconberg, undeterred by Edward's victory at Tewkesbury, made numerous attempts to enter the capital, falling back on Rochester and then Sandwich only after massive assaults from Edward's captains in the City. Having arrayed for the Bastard, the men of Kent, Sussex and Essex were 'sat upon' by the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Essex, who allegedly punished 'many other that were not there ... and so the king had out of Kent much good and little love'.⁴

In East Anglia the fighting came no closer than the second battle of St Albans in 1460. In 1461, however, Essex, Hertfordshire and Suffolk were entreated by the new King to follow Scarborough's lead in helping to raise a fleet at their own cost against the French - ever ready to exploit England during political crises.⁵ Cambridgeshire witnessed riots in 1464, when 'traitors and rebels' fomented unrest. In fact widespread revolt in parts of East Anglia required commissions of oyer and terminer and even a visit from the King himself.⁶ In 1468 a 'Lancastrian' conspiracy involving Master James Mackerell was uncovered in the region, perhaps connected with the earl of Oxford under suspicion at this time.⁷ In March, 1471 the earl was at Hedingham gathering a force of East Anglians to prevent Edward IV from landing off the Norfolk coast on his return from exile in Burgundy. Despite Edward's support there from the

2. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 762; P. W. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury* (Gloucester, 1990), p. 8. It was around this time that men from Kent attacked Southwark, held by the duke of Norfolk and Lord Bergavenny; in 1468 they had plundered one of the seats of Earl Rivers in the county, apparently hostile to the King's patronage of his wife's kin: *V.C.H., Kent*, Vol. 3, p. 265; *V.C.H., Surrey*, Vol. 1, p. 364 for Southwark.

3. According to C. F. Richmond, a good proportion of gentry and yeomen from most hundreds joined Fauconberg in 1471; the standing of his force is discussed by Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 173-4, and also by implication at least in Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 48, 73 and see below, n.41; C. F. Richmond, 'Fauconberg's Kentish Rising of May, 1471', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXV (1970), pp. 673-92. See also *Arrivall*, pp. 33-9.

4. *Warkworth*, p. 21.

5. *V.C.H., Essex*, Vol. 2, p. 267.

6. Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 58.

7. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 45.

dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk and Earl Rivers, Oxford had control of the region as the King's landing party was advised at Cromer on 12 March.⁸ The earl of Oxford remained disaffected, and in 1473, once again with French backing he landed briefly at St Osyth, Essex, but re-embarked in the face of the King's troops without striking a blow.⁹

The central-southern shires of Oxfordshire and Berkshire were also largely free from the upheavals. Yet the mood of unrest occasionally infiltrated the Home Counties. In 1461-2 the Chancellor of Oxford excommunicated those who had disfigured royal arms within the University, and in 1471 proctors were given an extra financial incentive to help keep the peace in the aftermath of the battle of Tewkesbury.¹⁰ In the north of the county Banbury was a meeting place for the troops who engaged at Danes Moor in Edgcote, Northamptonshire in 1469. Forces were also assembled here by Clarence in 1471.¹¹ In neighbouring Berkshire, Newbury held by the duke of York was attacked by the earl of Wiltshire in 1460, who executed those sympathetic to York.¹² Civil strife early in 1461 necessitated a commission of inquiry which found that a certain element was 'killing, spoiling, and oppressing the King's subjects'.¹³

Berkshire played a more significant role in the spring of 1471. When Margaret of Anjou gathered her forces in the West before the battle of Tewkesbury, her intention had been to cut through Berkshire and on to London. Accordingly she despatched her agents 'to make men understand that they would have drawn towards Reading, and by Berkshire and Oxfordshire have drawn towards London, or else fallen upon the King at some great advantage'.¹⁴ In reply, Edward made for Abingdon from Windsor where he issued a proclamation denouncing the rebels as traitors and reasserting his title to the crown. His speedy march west ended the Queen's hopes of reaching the capital and placed her at a strategic disadvantage - the outcome of which was her defeat at Tewkesbury. Windsor was the centre of further activity when in 1473 the King accused his guest, Warwick's brother, George Neville, archbishop of York, of involvement in Oxford's conspiracy; imprisoned there he was later sent to Hammes Castle in

8. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 57.

9. V.C.H., Essex, Vol. 2, pp. 217, 267; Ross, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 89; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, pp. 56-7.

10. V.C.H., Oxfordshire, Vol. 4, p. 21.

11. V.C.H., Oxfordshire, Vol. 10, p. 7.

12. V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 2, p. 138.

13. C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 28.

14. Arrivall, p. 74; V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 2, p. 138.

the March of Calais. Later, Margaret of Anjou was also imprisoned at Windsor and then at Wallingford.¹⁵

Of all the regions the West Country was most affected by the disputes between the crown and its opposition. Sedition had flourished in its towns and ports which had aided the rebels' arrival or departure from the country - ironically, Edward, among them. When the earl of March with Salisbury, Warwick and others returned to Calais after their humiliation at Ludford in 1459 it was by way of Dartmouth.¹⁶ Mounting their invasion in June 1460 from Calais prior to the battle of Northampton, the 'Yorkist' earls avoided the West (as noted) where the earl of Devon, Margaret of Anjou's firm ally was busy recruiting from his estates, having been joined by the duke of Somerset, just returned from Dieppe via Weymouth. After the failure of the Lincolnshire revolt in 1470, Warwick and Clarence fled through Lancashire south into Gloucestershire passing through Bristol, 'where Warwick is said to have left his guns and his baggage' and on to Exeter where they stayed at the Bishop's palace 'a few days'. Gathering ships, they left by way of Dartmouth, with the King in hot pursuit.¹⁷ Edward made his way to Exeter via Coventry and Burford to find that the rebels had already left.¹⁸ When Warwick and Clarence returned from exile a few months later having aligned with Margaret of Anjou and the Prince of Wales with the help of Louis XI, they came by way of Dartmouth and Plymouth.¹⁹ Queen Margaret herself entered the country from France through Weymouth from Dieppe on the day of the battle of Barnet, 14 April, 1471, and made for Cerne Abbey. Here she was joined by the duke of Somerset (who had taken sanctuary here ten years earlier) and others before the company departed for Exeter, Taunton, Wells and then on to Gloucester.²⁰

As well as its strategic importance in terms of invading forces, the West had often arrayed for disaffected nobles. Somerset and Hampshire illustrate the point. In the summer of 1459

15. V.C.H., Berkshire, Vol. 3, p. 12.

16. Dartmouth in fact belonged to Clarence; see the comments of Exeter antiquarian, John Hooker, *op.cit.*, pp. 53-4.

17. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 17; C.R.B.L., p. 8; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 121; Hooker, *op.cit.*; Hicks, *False, Fleeting Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 72.

18. C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 217; Ramsay, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 352; Hooker, *op.cit.*

19. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations* p. 121; *The Chronicles of the White Rose of York*, ed. J. A. Giles (London, 1845), pp. 28-9; C.P.R., 1467-77, pp. 214-6; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 152; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 32. Ross makes the point that more contemporary sources do not stipulate the port, naming only Devonshire as the avenue into the country.

20. *Arrivall*, p. 22; *Warkworth*, p. 16; Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 558-9, 563-4, 582-3; Calmette and Perinelle, *op.cit.*, pp. 133-42; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 169.

while Margaret gathered a force in the North, the duke of Somerset and the earl of Devon mustered in the West and then marched through Bath, Cirencester and Evesham to join the northern levy.²¹ Two years later Margaret's supporters again stirred the county against the new King. A commission of arrest and imprisonment was intended to round up 'certain evil disposed persons,' adherents of 'the late duke of Somerset, the late earl of Wiltshire, Robert, late Lord Hungerford' and the elderly Lady Hungerford who were making 'divers suspicious congregations in Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire'.²² Simultaneously crews were ordered to sea off the Somerset coast to act against Edward's enemies.²³ In 1471 when Margaret landed in Dorset from France, she was met by Somerset, the earl of Devon and others who 'sent all about in Somersetshire, Dorsetshire and part of Wiltshire, for to aready and array the people by a certain day', having before 'greatly laboured to that intent, preparing the country by all means to them possible'.²⁴ Warwick had also been busy to this end so that Somerset was 'the more lightly enduced now'.²⁵ Riders had surveyed the area enabling the force to march 'the straight way to Taunton, Glastonbury, and after to Wells, where hovering about the county they sent another time their foreriders to a town called Yeovil, and to Bruton'.²⁶ 'As they went they gathered the able men of all those parts'.²⁷

In Hampshire, Winchester, one of Henry VI's frequent residences, was among the first cities to be included in the Act of Oblivion in Edward's first parliament of November, 1461.²⁸ As with Somerset several commissions of array were issued in the early years of Edward's reign against rebel forces.²⁹ And, on occasion, Southampton paid the price for sedition. In October 1469 the city witnessed an act of cruelty by John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester which inflamed many. After Warwick and Clarence's defeat at Edgecote, they made for sea, and, hiring ships, sailed probably from Plymouth to Southampton, to be defeated there by Anthony Woodville, Lord Scales. Worcester stood trial over the rebels 'and so twenty persons of gentlemen and yeomen were hanged, drawn and quartered and headed...for which the people of the land were

-
21. William Worcester *Itineraries*, p. 184; 'Gregory's Chronicle', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. G. Gairdner (London, 1876), pp. 209-10; see below for the advantages of a West Country landing for rebels crossing from France.
 22. C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 101.
 23. V.C.H., Somerset, Vol. 2, p. 251.
 24. *Arrivall*, pp. 22-3.
 25. *Arrivall*, p. 23.
 26. Holinshed, *op.cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 316.
 27. *Arrivall*, p. 23.
 28. V.C.H., Hampshire, Vol. 5, p. 319.
 29. C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 571.

greatly displeased'.³⁰ In June, 1470 a commission of array was established in Hampshire for defence against Warwick and Clarence who had returned (as noted) to England via the South West. The earl's wife, Anne, countess of Warwick crossed from Normandy to Southampton. She had previously docked at Portsmouth intending to meet Margaret of Anjou who had landed at Weymouth. On learning at Southampton that Edward had 'won the field upon her husband at Barnet and there slain him...' she took sanctuary at Beaulieu where Edmund, duke of Somerset, Thomas earl of Devonshire and others 'came in great haste' and presented themselves to her.³¹ It was also at Southampton that the Bastard of Fauconberg fell into Gloucester's hands after his attempt to rescue Henry VI from the Tower in 1471.³²

Few areas in the South remained completely isolated from the tensions which surfaced periodically and it is possible to detect patterns in the commitment of certain regions - or in the ability of lords to gather support there at strategic times. It is clear that in 1459-60 parts of the South East were disenchanted with Henry VI's rule. Still stinging from the harsh penalties imposed on the region after Cade's revolt in 1450, and angered by the crown's continued reliance on 'corrupt' ministers, Salisbury and Warwick were able to recruit 'footmen of the commons of Kent, Sussex and Surrey' estimated by eye-witnesses to have been in excess of 20,000.³³ While this must be an exaggeration, nevertheless the region, particularly Kent, was traditionally volatile. In proximity to London, its numerous townspeople and independent freeholders displayed a political awareness and a readiness for action more noticeable here than elsewhere. In contrast, the crown was able to muster in the South West against York, and nobles such as the dukes of Somerset and Exeter, the earl of Devon and Lord Hungerford were active in the King's cause at this time.

While there are discernible patterns between the regions in terms of support for the crown and its opposition during conflict, there is certainly no clear-cut division, however, between East and West. The type of support mustered for either party was most often determined itself by the pattern of landholding within the region. During the reign of Henry VI the crown had strongholds in the West, particularly in Wiltshire through its duchy of Lancaster estates, and

30. 'The Chronicles of the White Rose of York', pp. 114-5.

31. *Arrivall*, p. 22; Hall, *op.cit.*, p. 298. According to Hall Margaret also took refuge here, but this is unlikely; the 'Chronicles of the White Rose of York' notes Margaret's refuge as Cerne Abbey, see p. 70.

32. *V.C.H., Hampshire*, Vol. 5, p. 320.

33. J. Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1981), p. 11. As Gillingham says, this is clearly a huge exaggeration, yet it was obviously a large crowd; see also Ross, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 45, and Goodman, *op.cit.*, p. 37.

in Cornwall, Devon, Dorset and elsewhere though its duchy of Cornwall lands. Yet both the 'Yorkist' and 'Lancastrian' interests were well represented in the region by 1461. Dorset serves to illustrate the point. Margaret Beaufort's father, John, duke of Somerset, grandson of John of Gaunt, inherited numerous lands which, through his daughter, became the property entitlements of Henry Tudor. Likewise, Richard, duke of York through his mother's Mortimer connections, and also as the maternal grandson of the duke of Clarence, came to possess substantial interests in Dorset and elsewhere. The landed strength, in fact, of both 'sides' is one of the factors reflected in the support mustered during the periods of conflict from the 1450s.³⁴

In addition, it is not always clear that support for particular leaders was as cut and dried as some have assumed. Much emphasis has been placed by historians on the commitment or loyalty to the cause - whether 'Yorkist' or 'Lancastrian' - of the rank and file. Describing the South East as 'Yorkist' in 1460, writers have attributed the popular support enjoyed by Salisbury, Warwick and March to disenchantment with Lancastrian government, which Warwick skilfully exploited through a massive propaganda campaign. Certainly in the ten years since Cade's revolt Henry VI had done little to redress society's grievances, and many of the lesser gentry and yeomanry were drawn to the 'Yorkist' cause.³⁵ Historians have also cited the financial burden imposed on the mercantile community in the capital and the South East by a King who favoured alien merchants. No doubt merchant sentiment was influenced as much by the need to curry favour with Warwick as warden of the Cinque ports and captain of Calais, and adherence to the 'Yorkist' cause (and hopefully, Yorkist control of the garrison) as the only means by which they could recoup their investment - as belief in the rightness of York's claim.³⁶ Further, the region's volatility is manifest in disturbances, which (despite Warwick's following in the South East among the local community) in 1464 saw those 'friends of Warwick' who had responded so favourably to York, in open rebellion which required a personal visit

34. V.C.H., Dorset, Vol. 2, pp. 140-2; in terms of the duchess of York's landed wealth see, for example, the lay subsidy roll of 1472/3 in which she is listed as the chief landowner in Gussage St Michael, Dorset: Dorset R.O., D/WLC. See below for discussion on both royal and rebel assistance within the regions.

35. 'William Gregory's Chronicle of London', p. 206; *An English Chronicle*, ed. J. S. Davies, Camden Society, First Series, Vol. LXIV (London, 1856), p. 91 for Yorkist support in the South East, and pp. 86-90 for grievances focussed on by the 'Yorkists'; see also R. L. Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster* (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 196-7; Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 23-4; Gillingham, *op.cit.*, p. 110. See also V.C.H., Kent, Vol. 3, p. 295 and V.C.H., Surrey, Vol. 1, p. 394, where the earl of Arundel with vast estates was 'Yorkist'.

36. Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 45.

from Edward, who was forced to quickly array and ride through Kent and Sussex.³⁷ Again, many have stressed Warwick's support here six years later. Yet in 1470 not only had the earl lost the captaincy of Calais and the wardenship of Dover and the Cinque Ports, but his cause was now ostensibly 'Lancastrian';³⁸ indeed, although Warwick eventually landed in Dartmouth, he *could* have landed in Kent where 'he was assured his friends were ready to rise'.³⁹ In actual fact, Warwick's support in the South East was based largely on his positions as warden of the Cinque Ports and captain of Calais. When he lost these posts he lost solid support. Evidence suggests that in 1470 he had great difficulty in stirring substantial men in Kent, Sussex and Calais and only four names appear on a list of goods forfeited by the rebels.⁴⁰ Similarly, while the revolt in 1471 of Fauconberg's natural son, the Bastard, attracted many, the evidence suggests that few were solid, and most had 'axes to grind'.⁴¹ It is, in fact, misleading to partition the South in terms of 'Lancaster and York' - for and against. In regard to this area, at that time, the seduction of a campaign for the rank and file most probably lay in the prospect of payment and regular rations; for a proportion with a vested interest in the South East, it was important to remain on-side with powerful nobles with great influence in the region. In terms of the solid gentry, it may be interesting to note their response to the upheavals in 1460-1 and 1470-1, later in the discussion.⁴²

Similarly the West Country has often been portrayed as 'Lancastrian'. It is clear that the lordships (in the gift of the crown) granted to royal kin and pre-eminent lords, were often used as bases for gathering support. For example much land in and around Weymouth was granted to Margaret of Anjou by Henry VI in 1452 and she and her allies made use of its port as noted.⁴³ Yet the borough of Weymouth was one of Richard of York's possessions, and on his death most

37. Ross, *ibid.*, p. 24; Gillingham, *op.cit.*, p. 107. It is difficult to know just what prompted sedition at this time. It was not Warwick inspired as at this stage he was still well-in with Edward. Certainly Margaret of Anjou and her allies had been stirring up the country as a prelude to Hexham in May, 1464, and in the South disturbances affected the West Country, the South East and parts of East Anglia, see above; see also *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, pp. 303-4.

38. John, Lord Howard had become governor and lieutenant of the garrison; Dover and the Cinque Ports had been put under the control of the earl of Arundel as constable and Sir John Scott as lieutenant. Edward himself rode to Dover and Sandwich to inspect their defences in late July, 1470. See Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 149; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 206, 209, 220.

39. *V.C.H.*, Kent, Vol. 3, p. 295; *V.C.H.*, Surrey, Vol. 1, p. 364.

40. Hicks, *False, Fleeting Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 73.

41. See Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 91-3.

42. See below, Chapters 7 and 8.

43. *V.C.H.*, Dorset, Vol. 2, pp. 141-2, 193.

probably passed to his wife along with his other acquisitions.⁴⁴ Accordingly, it should not be assumed that the Queen had the total support of the area. In fact in 1461 the town enjoyed benefits from Edward IV including one hundred pounds 'in recompense of the losses they had sustained in supporting him' and further gifts in 1467.⁴⁵ When the Queen landed there in 1471, the inclement weather as much as local support probably influenced her decision;⁴⁶ and although help was requested from Somerset, Devon and part of Wiltshire against 'Edward Earl of March' from allies 'with all such fellowship as you can make', not all complied: forty men from Salisbury promised to the duke of Somerset fought in fact for the King.⁴⁷ Similarly, while Margaret replenished her supplies of 'money, men and artillery' at Bristol 'by such as were the King's rebels in that town', at Gloucester the local support she enjoyed did not hinder Richard Beauchamp's army preventing her from crossing the Severn in an effort to join up with her Welsh forces.⁴⁸ Yet again, at Tewkesbury the townspeople probably prevented the Queen once more from crossing the Severn and occupying a much better defensive position against Edward IV's advancing army.⁴⁹ Other towns were more cooperative such as Exeter, Bath and Cirencester, where efforts were made repeatedly to gather support for Margaret's cause. Undoubtedly the earl of Warwick's vast estates in the South West helped his cause as did the Benedictine abbey of Cerne which took part in Margaret's preparations for war both early in Edward's reign and ten years later, on the eve of the battle of Tewkesbury.

44. See above, p. 8.

45. V.C.H., Dorset, Vol. 2, p. 193.

46. *Ibid.*

47. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 81.

48. *Arrivall*, pp. 25-7; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 84; V.C.H., Gloucester, Vol. 4, p. 21: Gloucester Castle was granted to Richard, duke of Gloucester in 1462 although rescinded some years later.

49. V.C.H., Gloucester, Vol. 8, p. 116; Tewkesbury, part of the Beauchamp's estates was divided between Gloucester and Clarence in 1471: V.C.H., Gloucester, Vol. 6, p. 191; see also A. Jones, *Tewkesbury* (Surrey, 1987), pp. 41-3, who suggests that Margaret had little support at Gloucester and less at Tewkesbury; that after Warwick's death at Towton, the town's stance was 'Yorkist' following its division between the dukes of Clarence and Gloucester.

CHAPTER 7

THE CROWN IN CRISIS: A RETROSPECTIVE

In October 1483 at Leicester, Richard III prepared to meet his adversaries. Awaiting his levies from the North and South, the King took stock - sizing up the opposition and debating plans of attack, counter-attack and contingencies in case of mishap. It was also a time for reflection. As yet unaware of the extent of the opposition, Richard no doubt pondered the nature of disaffection in the South which had worried his brother from the early 1460s. He reflected perhaps on the political upheavals during the Yorkist regime: the war of succession in 1460-1, 'Lancastrian' disaffection, 1461-4, and the regional revolts and noble efforts to control the crown, 1469-71. He almost certainly recalled the land and sea routes used by the rebels; the size and composition of the revolts; the noble and gentry support for the disaffected, as well as for the crown; the regional power-bases of the greater aristocracy, and those familiar and powerful families with a history of active political involvement. At Leicester Richard might have felt confident in his appraisal of the nature of the revolt. As he moved south, however, and even though the rising crumbled before him, he would have become aware that this was not like other rebellions, in composition or extent.¹

From Leicester the royal host made for Coventry, and then due south to Oxford, where Richard visited Magdalen College on 28 October. Pressing on, the King made straight for Salisbury, and then to Dorchester, Bridport and Exeter. While the success of Richard's lieutenants in the March of Wales and the South East left him free to pursue the rebels in the West Country, it is little wonder that the King, himself, made for Salisbury and then Exeter. The western sectors of the rising had provided the main thrust of the revolt. Henry Tudor was to land off the Dorset coast, joining forces with the marquis of Dorset, Thomas St Leger, Thomas Arundel and Edward Courtenay. While little is known of the royal progress from Salisbury to Exeter, doubtless the King was spurred on by the threat of Henry Tudor's invasion, and the need to make Exeter quickly, 'where all his enemies had made a stand'.

While Richard contemplated his enemies in 1483, his family were no strangers to conflict: Edward IV had dealt repeatedly with sedition since 1461, and his father, Richard, duke of York had intervened in national affairs in 1450. The cause of York's intercession and the

¹ A number of texts have been used for the following section, among them C. Ross, *Edward IV and The Wars of the Roses* ; J. Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses* ; A. Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses*; R. L. Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster*, and R. A. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority 1422-1461* .

background to the dynastic conflict of 1460-1, had their roots in 1422 and Henry V's death in August of that year, leaving an infant son not yet nine months old. The aristocratic council which ruled in Henry VI's name for fifteen years was in the hands of the young King's great-uncle, Henry Beaufort, cardinal bishop of Winchester, and his uncle, Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. Despite tensions the council ruled with maturity, successfully containing the rivalry between Beaufort and Gloucester over their defensive and aggressive foreign policies, respectively.

Despite the slide in England's fortunes abroad, the crippling costs that war with France had incurred, the degree of civil unrest in the counties and tensions at court - none of the problems which confronted the young King in 1437 was insoluble.² Yet strong leadership was vital; much depended on the character of the King who played a pivotal role in the direction of policy and the administration of government. Skill was required to get the country back on a sound economic footing, to forge a viable treaty with France and to rule the country with a firm hand. Henry VI, however, was without the strength of character and intellect to cope well; too easily influenced he was a pacifist but not a leader of men. From the start the court faction manipulated and isolated the King, blocking access to him. A severe mental breakdown in the early 1450s, saw Henry's cousin the duke of York lead the government as Protector. Simultaneously, the birth of a long-awaited son saw the emergence of Margaret of Anjou as a formidable force in English politics.³

In March 1450 the King's main councillor, William de la Pole, duke of Suffolk, was impeached. Banished by Henry for five years, the duke was murdered in April as he set sail from Ipswich. Shocked courtiers blamed the men of Kent, vociferous in their opposition to the King's policies and court favourites. In May, the rebellion of Jack Cade broke in Kent. For a number of weeks in June and July the government danced to Cade's tune until he was killed on 12 July. More a political than a social or economic statement - yet the government survived.⁴ Cade's revolt was seen by some as a 'kite-flyer' for Richard, duke of York, who intervened in national politics late in 1450. Articulating the rebels' grievances, York had personal as well as pragmatic reasons for intervention. As the descendant of Edmund of Langley, first duke of York

2. By 1429 the conquest of France was beyond reach, and from this time France began to recover ground lost to England; the country's fortunes were further affected by the death in 1435 of John, duke of Bedford (who had directed England's foreign policy) together with the loss of England's main ally, Burgundy.

3. Goodman, *op.cit.*, p. 227; Ross, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 17; A. J. Pollard, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1988), p. 4; Gillingham, *op.cit.*, p. 52.

4. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 286-294, 610-649; Storey, *op.cit.*, pp. 61-8.

and fourth son of Edward III, and through his Mortimer mother from Lionel of Clarence, Edward's second son, York had a solid double-claim in view of Henry's barren marriage. Yet Edmund Beaufort, duke of Somerset who had replaced York as captain in France, and had worked his way into the heart of Henry's council also had a claim.⁵ In Ireland, away from the centre of government and without the offices and influence, his due as the most powerful noble, York feared that Somerset might be seen as the next Lancastrian heir. Closely watching Somerset's progress in France, York seized the opportunity to return from Ireland soon after Somerset's arrival in England following defeat abroad.⁶

With Henry VI's breakdown, York's star was soon in the ascendant. His appointment as Protector in 1453 and, shortly after, the support of the powerful Nevilles augmented his position. But it was not an easy ride;⁷ and in February 1455, the duke's position deteriorated with Henry's recovery.⁸ Soon after, however, York's co-called 'second protectorate' began, and for the next four years an uneasy peace was maintained largely by Henry VI and Humphrey, first duke of Buckingham, almost as powerful as York himself.⁹

5. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, p. 666; Storey, *ibid.*, p. 74.

6. The duke took up the common cause voicing his outrage over the French losses and the excesses of Henry's court. Through parliament York sought to arraign Somerset and others on a charge of treason and to push through an act of resumption cancelling the King's grants to favoured subjects. When the duke failed using constitutional methods to curb Henry's excesses, he took up arms. With defeat at Dartford, York retired to Wales. And with the earl of Devon as his only solid supporter, his prospects were dim: Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 686-691.

7. In the North tension between the most powerful families the Nevilles and the Percy earls of Northumberland, and in the South West between the Courtenay earl of Devon and Lord Bonville (the former having switched from York now allied with his Neville enemies) made this a difficult time for York, careful not to appear partisan. Margaret of Anjou fearful for her infant son's succession aligned herself with York's fiercest opposition - Northumberland and Devon.

8. Once again isolated, York and the Nevilles took to arms. The result was the first battle of St Albans in May, 1455, the capture of the King and the death of Henry's key allies, Somerset, Northumberland and Lord Clifford: Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 715-745.

9. Margaret of Anjou having aligned with York's enemies, took the King and court to Kenilworth, Coventry and Chester, and tapping the crown's resources, cultivated the young earls of Shrewsbury and Wiltshire, the new duke of Somerset, the second earl of Northumberland and Lord Clifford: Ross, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 35-7.

With the support of Henry's half-brothers, Jasper Tudor earl of Pembroke and Edmund Tudor, earl of Richmond, the Queen at Coventry excluded York, based in London, from the Great Council. With both factions surreptitiously arming, conflict seemed inevitable. The first clash at Blore Heath in September, 1459, was inconclusive. Moving on to Ludlow, the rout at Ludford followed when York, promised a royal pardon (which was in fact a ruse) was deserted by his troops. The duke fled to Ireland; his captains, the earls of Salisbury, Warwick, Lord Fauconberg and York's son, Edward, earl of March fled to Calais, Warwick's stronghold as captain there. In November, 1459 a packed parliament attainted York and his leaders. The scene was set.

With York in Ireland, the earls of Salisbury, Warwick and March maintained their position in Calais, managing to beat off any attacks. They also began a major propaganda campaign, reminiscent of Cade's manifesto, which indicted Henry's VI's councillors and lamented York's exclusion from court. Their main opposition, the earls of Shrewsbury, Wiltshire and others were denounced as 'mortal and extreme enemies' who excluded the group from their rightful places 'beside the king'. On 26 June 1460, the earls landed in Kent, and marched on to London. Control of the City was of paramount importance as the financial and administrative centre of the country. Without pausing, the earls made for Northampton where they engaged the King's forces on 10 July 1460. The support for March and Warwick included the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of London, Exeter, Lincoln, Salisbury, Ely and Rochester; Viscount Bourghier, Lords Stourton, Fauconberg, Audley, Bergavenny, Say and Scrope of Bolton. The notables with the King included Buckingham, Shrewsbury, Viscount Beaumont and Lord Egremont, younger son of the earl of Northumberland. Warwick and March won the day and captured the King, who counted among his losses, Buckingham, Shrewsbury, Viscount Beaumont and Lord Egremont.¹⁰

Having taken Henry, Warwick and Salisbury ruled uneasily for three months while York inexplicably remained in Ireland. When the duke finally came to the capital, he put forward his claim to the throne - a move which surprised and dismayed his allies and alienated many among the lords. The compromise, the October 10 Act of Accord which recognised Henry VI as King for the rest of his natural life while disinheriting Edward, Prince of Wales, and which stipulated York as the next ruler, antagonised the Queen who mobilised her forces: the duke of Somerset and the earl of Devon mustered in the West Country, and joined Margaret at Hull, together with the duke of Exeter and the earl of Northumberland. On 9 December 1460 York with his second son, Edmund earl of Rutland, left London for the North along with the earl of

10. During the battle Lord Grey of Ruthyn, leader of Henry's vanguard, defected: Storey, *op.cit.*, p. 188; Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 26-7.

Salisbury. The earl of March went to Ludlow to halt Jasper Tudor's activity in Wales, while Warwick and the duke of Norfolk remained in London. In Yorkshire on 30 December the battle of Wakefield took place. The duke of York was killed along with Rutland, while Salisbury was captured and later beheaded.¹¹ Fresh from her win a jubilant Margaret made for the South, and engaged the 'Yorkist' forces under Warwick at St Albans, Hertfordshire on 17 February, 1461. With a resounding victory over the earl, the Queen retook the King. Warwick and March could either flee or install the latter as a rival monarch. Margaret, meanwhile, unable to win the loyalty of London, hostile after her troops' reckless activity, withdrew northward. This allowed Edward, just eighteen and fresh from victory over the Welsh 'Lancastrians' at Mortimer's Cross, to ride into London at the head of his army - looking every inch a King. The young earl had himself proclaimed King on 4 March, 1461.

With the biggest battle yet to come, Edward put energy into his preparations to secure the kingdom. He despatched his lieutenants throughout the South to muster forces, and had begun his journey north by 13 March, 1461. Little over two weeks later around seventy-five percent of the nobility was present and perhaps 50,000 men at the battle of Towton.¹² Commanding Henry VI's forces were the dukes of Exeter and Somerset, the earls of Northumberland, Westmorland, Devon, Wiltshire and Shrewsbury, Viscount Beaumont, Lords Roos, Rougemont-Grey, Clifford and Dacre of Gillesland. A number of these were killed including the earls of Northumberland, Devon and Wiltshire; for Edward, in addition to those mentioned, was the duke of Norfolk. With a decisive victory for the new King, the aristocratic families who had turned out for Henry VI were now leaderless, Henry, Margaret and their son having fled to Scotland with the dukes of Exeter, Somerset, lords Roos and Rougemont-Grey. Thus Edward IV had won the 'war of succession'; the nobles who had remained loyal to the deposed King capitulated, and not until 1471 were dissident forces to turn out in such large numbers for a repeat performance of Towton at the battle of Tewkesbury.

The young King, however, struggled to maintain his kingdom during the early 1460s. In the West Country supporters of the dukes of Exeter and Somerset, and the earl of Wiltshire caused 'suspicious congregations' which worried the crown late in 1461 and in 1462.¹³ Nor were these idle fears: the earl of Oxford involved in conspiracy was brought to trial and executed in late February, 1462.¹⁴ In Wales and the Marches, Lord Herbert, authorised to raise a fleet and to bring the rebels to heel, extinguished the remaining resistance to Edward, with the exception of

11. Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 30.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 36-8; Ross, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 55, 138.

13. Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 163-5; Ross, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 55.

14. C.P.R., 1461-7, pp. 132-3; Scofield, *op.cit.*, pp. 231-4.

the coastal fortress of Harlech which held out for seven years.¹⁵ Preoccupied with northern insurrection, however, the King also feared a French invasion.¹⁶ And his fears were justified. Margaret signed a treaty with Louis XI in April, 1462, and then retreated to Scotland. Although the King himself later secured a truce with Louis and the Scots against the Queen, the northern garrisons proved troublesome, while parts of the South were also in revolt. In fact early in 1464 the South broke out in civil unrest reminiscent of the troubles of 1461. In January and February commissions of oyer and terminer were instituted in fifteen counties from Kent to

-
15. C.P.R., 1461-7, pp. 14, 36-9, 45, 65, 98-100; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 48. While commissions of inquiry and arrest mopped up most resistance in the South West, and with Wales under control, Edward had most to fear from the North. Although risings in the North had been quashed by John Neville, Lord Montagu (Warwick's brother), Edward had no real authority in Northumberland. And while the fortunes of the once powerful Percy family had taken a turn, (the second earl of Northumberland had died at St Albans in 1455; the third earl at Towton, while his son, later the fourth earl, was in the Tower) the region remained loyal to them. Remote and inaccessible (and providing a stepping-stone to Scotland and sanctuary for the rebels) the county had aided Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou, and although Edward cultivated Sir Ralph Percy, younger son of the second earl, he repeatedly supported the deposed King between 1461-3. The King had given command of the stronghold of Dunstanburgh to Sir Ralph Percy in 1461, which he promptly handed over to Margaret when she arrived in 1462. Re-appointed captain of the fortress along with Bamburgh later in the year, he repeatedly supported the deposed King between 1461-3.
16. The death of Charles VII in July 1461 (mildly interested in Margaret's cause) was followed by the accession of his son Louis XI, who at first courted the King, then flirted with the dissidents. Edward for his part, although concerned, gained mileage from the situation, exhorting the realm to resist those who with the French would destroy 'the people, the name, the tongue and the blood English of this our said realm'. The treaty signed by Margaret with Louis at Chinon, broadened into the Truce of Tours of June, in which Louis promised financial backing to an incursion by way of Scotland, for which he would receive Calais. Yet Louis could not take Calais without taking on the duke of Burgundy who refused to allow French troops across his territory. Edward, in response collected the kingdom calling almost all the nobility to his side. His force was comprised of two dukes, seven earls, thirty one barons, fifty nine knights and perhaps thirty to forty thousand men. Margaret retreated to Scotland while the King confronted the north-eastern strongholds under Warwick. Towards the end of 1463, Margaret's position deteriorated: although distracted by riots throughout the South, Edward worked to deprive the rebels of French support by securing a truce with Louis XI and the Scottish government: Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 441; Calmette and Perinelle, *op.cit.*, pp. 19-21; Scofield, *op.cit.*, pp. 250-3, 329, 334-5; J. G. Bellamy, 'Justice under the Yorkist Kings', *American Journal of Legal History*, Vol. IX (1965), pp. 136-7; 'Gregory's Chronicle', *op.cit.*, pp. 223-6; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 59.

Cornwall and as far north as Warwick and Leicester. Riots in Gloucestershire resulted in Edward's own attendance at sessions of oyer and terminer against those who were 'blinded and deceived by the malicious labour...[of] our traitors and rebels', and forced the King to prorogue parliament due to meet in York on 20 February.¹⁷

In late April, 1464, the northern garrisons finally fell to Edward;¹⁸ and the crown enjoyed a respite from rebellion until late 1467, when civil unrest and reports of treason and disaffection filtered into the capital. Edward was informed of local disturbances, family feuds, and 'great riots and oppressions' which necessitated commissions of oyer and terminer in the South and the Midlands. Rioting was widespread; as far afield as Kent, York and Wales. The most serious incident involved Jasper Tudor in league with Louis XI, who was defeated on 14 August 1468 by Lord Herbert.¹⁹ Fear engendered fear and a spy-network in the counties controlled by the sheriffs uncovered more dissidents. Household yeomen went into the country 'to arrest men that be impeached'.²⁰ Two such men caught in the South were the brother and heir of the former earl of Devon, who died at Northampton and the son of Lord Hungerford, executed after Hexham.²¹ Around this time John de Vere was arrested and sent to the Tower presumably because both his father and brother had been executed for treason, while others actually lost their lives for alleged dealings with 'Lancastrians'.²²

17. C.P.R., 1461-7, pp. 303-4; 'Gloucester Annals', in Kingsford, *op.cit.*, p. 356.

18. The duke of Somerset with men from Wales, Lancashire and Cheshire attempted to ambush Lord Montagu, and at Hedgeley Moor, near Alnwick in April, 1464, Montagu repelled the attack led by Somerset, Lords Roos and Hungerford. Three weeks later Montagu with Lords Greystoke and Willoughby defeated the rebels near Hexham, capturing and executing Somerset, Roos and Hungerford. Finally, the northern garrisons were subdued..

19. C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 529; C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 55; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 119; Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 423; H. T. Evans, *Wales in the Wars of the Roses* (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 165-6. John, Lord Wenlock was accused in London of sedition. He had recently returned from an embassy to France with Warwick. Unbeknownst to the earl, Edward IV was entertaining the Bastard of Burgundy while they were courting Louis. Both Burgundy and France sought an alliance with Edward, and as Ross says, Warwick was 'drawn into Louis' orbit while simultaneously falling out of Edward's'. It is likely that Wenlock's subsequent 'treason' was associated with his dealings with the French King.

20. Plumpton Correspondence, *op.cit.*, p. 30; Ramsay, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 326 and n.1; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 122.

21. H.M.C., Various Collections, Report IV, pp. 206-7; P.R.O., K.B. 9/320; *Warkworth*, p. 6.

22. Such as two servants of the duke of Norfolk, see Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 123 and Plumpton Correspondence, *op.cit.*, pp. 19-20.

How much it was a matter of real threat or simply alarmist behaviour by the crown is open to question. It is apparent, however, that there was popular discontent with Edward's government. As in 1460 (ten years after Cade's revolt) the malcontents towards the end of the decade saw little change in the years since Edward's accession. The grievances against the King's in-laws, the Woodvilles, were real enough and the earl of Warwick and his Neville kinsmen were quick to exploit them.²³ What was equally clear was that disaffection could only flourish if the royal house were divided. Not content with his new status, jealous of the King's court circle, and with Woodvilles wherever he looked, Warwick began to plan a coup d'etat, having seduced Edward's younger brother, the duke of Clarence into intrigue.²⁴

Piqued over Edward's refusal to support a match between Clarence and his elder daughter, Isabel, Warwick and his brother-in-law, the earl of Oxford crossed to Calais on 11 July 1469 where the marriage in fact, took place. The following day a manifesto was issued from Calais, while in Yorkshire Robin of Redesdale, (probably Sir John Conyers of Hornsby, Warwick's cousin by marriage) also circulated a document, denouncing the King for 'excluding the lords of

23. For grievances against the Woodvilles see *Warkworth*, pp. 11-12 and Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 124. Warwick had received lavish patronage from the man he had helped to the throne. In 1461 he became admiral of England, great chamberlain, captain of Calais, constable of Dover and warden of the Cinque ports together with an array of wardships and grants. His kinsmen also prospered: his uncle William Neville, Lord Fauconberg became earl of Kent; his brother George, became chancellor of England and Archbishop of York, while John, Lord Montagu was created the new earl of Northumberland in 1464. Warwick had enormous power and control but he began to feel vulnerable as early as May, 1464, when Edward married Elizabeth Woodville, a widow with two sons and five brothers and sisters. The marriage put paid to the earl's plans for a French match, and as Edward married his wife's kin to available courtiers and country powers - also to suitable matches for his own daughters. At the same time Edward promoted a number of leading gentry into the peerage, the household and the counties, men who became trusted friends and loyal officers; court favourites such as William Herbert, earl of Pembroke, Humphrey Stafford, briefly earl of Devon in 1469, lords Hastings, Ferrers and Howard, which embittered the Nevilles now overshadowed at court. Further, it was clear by 1467 with the dismissal of his brother from the chancellorship and his frustrated negotiations with Louis XI (by Edward, who concluded a treaty with Burgundy) that Warwick's heady days of power were over; and while the King still gave him gifts, it was not - the earl felt - on an appropriate scale. For Warwick's frustration over foreign policy see above and Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 72-3, 77, 91; Pocquet du Haut-Jussé *op.cit.*, p. 123; Calmette and Perinelle, *op.cit.*, p. 88.

24. Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 67.

the blood' from the councils, and for favouring self-serving courtiers.²⁵ Returning from Calais, Warwick and Clarence joined Redesdale's army, and engaged the King at Edgecote, Yorkshire. Gaining the upper hand, Warwick eventually took the King - who lost the earls of Pembroke, Devon and Rivers.²⁶ For the next three months Warwick attempted to rule with the King in captivity, yet when trouble broke out in the far North, the earl was unable to cope effectively and was forced to release Edward.²⁷ A revolt in Lincolnshire in February 1470, together with risings in Yorkshire and the South West were dealt with, but Clarence and Warwick were clearly implicated.²⁸ Denounced by Edward they fled once more to Calais.²⁹ Repulsed however by Lord Wenlock, the rebels, strengthened by the arrival at Normandy of Warwick's cousin, Lord Fauconberg, sought help from the King of France. Although Louis XI was initially hostile, by June, 1470 it was clear that he was helping to finance and array Warwick; in fact through his mediation an alliance between Margaret of Anjou and the earl was effected. With a plan to restore Henry VI, the rebels left for England on 9 September.³⁰ In the meantime Edward had not been idle. After Warwick's flight he had arrayed the southern counties and, with the earl of

25. Warkworth, p. 8.

26. Pembroke was taken and executed at Northampton on 27 or 28 July; Rivers was executed at Gosford Green outside Coventry: Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 9; Devon fled to Somerset and was executed at Bridgewater, Warkworth, p. 7; Sir Henry Neville, Lord Latimer also died; see also William Worcestre *Itineries*, pp. 339, 341.

27. The King was in London by mid-October, yet all was not well at Westminster. With Clarence, Warwick and Oxford in attendance, purporting to 'be his best friends, his household men have other language': Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 135.

28. The Lincolnshire revolt was originally, it seems, a private battle between Sir Thomas Burgh one of Edward's household men and his neighbour, Richard, Lord Welles. Hammond suggests that Edward intervened on Burgh's behalf, yet pardoned Welles in early March. Edward had taken Lord Welles into custody at Huntingdon and established that he had known of the rising in advance, implicating his kinsman, Sir Robert Welles who was executed on 19 March: Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 17; C.R.B.L., pp. 10-12; Warkworth, p. 8; C.P.R., 1467-77, pp. 218-9; see also R.L. Storey, 'Lincolnshire and the Wars of the Roses' *Nottingham Medieval Studies* (1970), pp. 71-2.

29. The King had solid support among the nobility as he chased the rebels down into Devon: the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, the earls of Shrewsbury, Arundel, Wiltshire, Earl Rivers (formerly Lord Scales), lords Hastings, Saye, Stanley, Mountjoy and Dudley: Ramsay, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 352; Hooker, *op.cit.*, pp. 53-4; C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 217.

30. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 66-7; Calmette and Perinelle, *op.cit.*, p. 112 and n.4; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 27; the formal betrothal of Edward of Lancaster and Warwick's daughter, Anne Neville took place at Angers on 25 July.

Worcester's aid, dealt severely with traitors in Salisbury and Southampton. Expecting an invasion from the South East, the King secured defences in Kent visiting Sandwich and Canterbury personally. However, the attack when it came was by way of Devon, while the King, caught off guard, was in the North dealing with revolt in Cumberland and Yorkshire.³¹

Well received in the West Country, Warwick issued yet another proclamation urging all men between sixteen and sixty to array and join his banner.³² Meanwhile Edward in the North was deserted by Warwick's brother, Lord Montagu with his substantial retinue, and while the royal host still included Gloucester, Hastings, Earl Rivers and others, the King decided to quit the country making for the Dutch coast near Alkmaar, where he was assisted by Louis of Bruges, Lord Gruthuyse, governor of Holland, former ambassador to England, and Edward's friend.³³

The Readeption of Henry VI which began officially on 1 October 1470, was moderate. Those out of favour with the new regime and omitted from the first parliament included lords Dinham and Dudley and the earl of Wiltshire, yet most others were included. Arrests were few: Edward's cousins, the Bourchiers, the earl of Essex, Lord Cromwell, Wiltshire, Lord Mountjoy and the duke of Norfolk, and these only temporary. John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester, who lost his head, was the only real casualty.³⁴ Yet nor were rewards lavish for the 'Lancastrians'. There was no wholesale redistribution of offices or land, a point of irritation for some of Warwick's allies. In fact it was Warwick who scooped the pool of offices and had the pick of the estates. Moreover there was division among the ruling party. 'Old-guard

31. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, nos. 204, 205.

32. When Warwick and Clarence entered London on 6 October, 1470, their force included Lord Stanley, the earl of Shrewsbury, the Bastard of Fauconberg and shortly after, the earl of Oxford: *The Great Chronicle of London*, pp. 211-2; Kingsford, *Chronicles of London*, p. 182; Warkworth, pp. 60-2; *The Chronicles of the White Rose of York*, ed. J. A. Giles (London, 1845), pp. 236-40; Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 537.

33. Edward was accompanied into exile by Gloucester, Rivers, Hastings, Lords Say and Duras: Warkworth, p. 11; for Edward's journey across England, *The Great Chronicle of England*, p. 211; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 123; Commynes, *op.cit.*, p. 187; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 36.

34. The country was unforgiving after the punishment meted out by Worcester to rebels at Southampton in the previous July; *The Great Chronicle of London*, pp. 212-3; Warkworth, pp. 5, 13; Kingsford, *Chronicles of London*, p. 182; Scofield, *op.cit.*, pp. 545-6; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 155.

Lancastrians' such as the duke of Somerset, and others such as Devon had little time for Warwick, and waited in the West for Margaret of Anjou and Edward of Lancaster.³⁵

Edward had remained in the Low Countries, largely ignored by the duke of Burgundy anxious to maintain good relations with England. However a treaty between Louis XI and England against the duke followed by a declaration of war by the countries in December 1470 and January 1471, changed his view. With ships and money from Burgundy as well as the Hanseatic League, Edward left Flushing on 11 March 1471. Unable to dock at Crowmer off the Norfolk coast, the party finally made Ravenspur where good fortune followed Edward south through Yorkshire, and deep into the Midlands in the form of thousands of followers brought in by Lord Hastings, the Stanleys and others.³⁶ Warwick at Coventry, separated from powerful nobles such as Somerset and Devon and without Clarence, who had been tempted back into the royal host by Edward, was isolated and vulnerable. Bypassing the earl in the Midlands, the King made for London where he was joined by lords Howard and Cromwell. On 11 April the City opened its gates to the King, and with little and ineffectual resistance from his opponents, London welcomed him. At Barnet and within a month Edward defeated the earl of Warwick, who died along with his brother Lord Montagu, while Oxford, his two brothers and Viscount Beaumont fled.³⁷

On the same day Margaret of Anjou landed at Weymouth. Accompanied by Lord Wenlock and joined by Somerset, his brother, John Beaufort, the earl of Devon and John Langstrother of the priory of St John, the 'whole might' of Devon and Cornwall flocked to her standard at Exeter. Courtenay at Tiverton had already been active in Margaret's cause, requesting assistance from the local notables on behalf of Henry VI, and '... so many persons as you many get to wait upon you...be at Exeter on Monday night to wait upon me'.³⁸ In fact the 'queen's army grew daily with supporters as well from Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire (for there were many in those western parts who preferred King Henry's cause...').³⁹ After deliberations on the best route, the rebels advanced through Taunton, Wells, Bath, Bristol, Berkeley and Gloucester,

35. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 45.

36. Edward was most fortunate in that Lord Montagu left him unmolested in Northumberland, while the earl of Northumberland also remained inactive (Montagu having lost the earldom); Warkworth, p. 14; Arrivall, pp. 6-7; *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 214; Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 571; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, pp. 56-61.

37. Warkworth, pp. 16-17; Arrivall, p. 21; Scofield, *op.cit.*, pp. 579-81.

38. See Arrivall, p. 31; for Devon's support, B.L. Add Ms 41140, f. 169.

39. Arrivall, p. 23; Ramsay, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 376; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 169; for quotation, *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 127.

hoping to make the Lancashire border and further assistance in the form of 'a considerable body of archers'.⁴⁰ Queen Margaret and her party ended their journey, however, at Tewkesbury on 3 May.

Edward, fresh from victory over Warwick at Barnet, also struck camp here on the same day, with his brothers Clarence and Gloucester, Lord Hastings and the Marquis of Dorset. Mindful of Margaret's support, the King was determined to extinguish the rebels before they attracted more of the country. Commissions of array were issued to fifteen counties and various towns were circulated for support. Edward had planned to head off the rebels- should they march on the capital - via the southern counties, as far from London as possible; alternatively if they made for the Welsh borderland, and Jasper Tudor, it was vital to prevent them crossing the Severn at Gloucester, or Tewkesbury or perhaps at Worcester.⁴¹ The King's agents saw through the Queen's ruse of various troop movements through the South West, and Edward guessing Margaret's plan, set in train his own preparations.

At Tewkesbury Edward fought with his brothers Clarence and Gloucester, Lord Hastings and the Marquis of Dorset; Margaret's most able captain, the duke of Exeter, was joined in battle by the earl of Devon, the Prince of Wales and Lord Wenlock. The armies which engaged were not large, but the fighting was fierce, and within a short time Edward and Gloucester had broken through Somerset's line fragmenting the 'Lancastrian' defence. Killed were Devon, John Beaufort, Wenlock and probably Prince Edward. Knighted by the King for their valiant efforts were George Neville, son and heir of Lord Bergavenny, and the Lord Chamberlain's brothers, Richard and Ralph Hastings.⁴²

If, by 1483, Richard had forgotten the details, he remembered the glory: his commendation by the King after the battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury, and his success in crushing the last pocket of resistance led by Warwick's cousin the Bastard of Fauconberg, at Southampton. He remembered too the stability after Tewkesbury, when except for the earl of Oxford's treason in 1473, and Clarence's alleged treachery in 1478, the kingdom had 'settled'. Riding west from Salisbury to crush the rebellion, he recalled the late King's consolidation through the 1470s

⁴⁰. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 127.

⁴¹. Support for the rebels would have been forthcoming from Cheshire and Lancashire, areas with 'traditional ties with the prince of Wales and John of Gaunt'.

⁴². Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, pp. 95-9; Arrivall, pp. 23-8; Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 69-70.

until his death little more than eight months ago; the powerful families - some of whom he had fought against in 1471 - but many more who had aided the crown. Already he saw that this was no mere 'Lancastrian' revolt against 'York'; it was not a revival of Lancastrian dissidents seizing the opportunity to oust the King in favour of Henry Tudor. They had been laid to rest at Tewkesbury over ten years ago; and this was much more. Never before had Richard seen such widespread resistance, and from so many solid rebels. Perplexingly this revolt included many of those Richard knew well as his brother's men; people he too had cultivated in the counties and at court - and never more than since his own accession just weeks ago in June 1483.

CHAPTER 8

THE GENTRY - A RETROSPECTIVE

1. Conflict and Tensions to 1461: Patronage and Politics

The following chapter is divided into two sections. The first will explore the patronage and politics from the 1430s to 1461 of the gentry families involved in the 1483 rebellion, focussing both on the central conflict and the regional response through successive crises. Simultaneously the power structures within the regions of revolt will be examined, and the gentry's interplay with the powers at court will be explored. Section two will discuss the same themes between 1461-1471 with particular emphasis on the major power-brokers in the South. The aim of the discussion is to discern patterns of gentry political activity and allegiance through the periods of unrest. How did the gentry respond to crises, and did they display a tradition of service which transcended faction?

The regions in southern England varied considerably in terms of magnate control throughout the fifteenth century. For most of the period the South West had a number of resident magnates vying for supremacy; in contrast, Berkshire and Oxfordshire were largely without powerful magnate control. Again, while East Anglia followed the West Country with competing noble interests, the South East, with influential and resident nobles, seemed largely free from baronial tensions. The differences between the regions are reflected to a degree in the types of patronage dispensed to leading gentry, particularly in the West and East Anglia, compared with the Central South and south-eastern counties. It is misleading, however, to view the gentry in any of the regions, and, particularly after 1471, as entirely dependent on a lord or lords for local influence and regional offices, or household positions and power at court. By the second half of the century the most prominent gentry families in the South were already established - in many cases for generations standing. This is most evident in a study of the 1483 rebels as the discussion has demonstrated. By 1483 leading knights and esquires in all regions were well patronised but also had their own 'direct line' to court. Prominent gentry were too powerful for local magnates to contain or for the crown to ignore; and despite competing powers in some areas seeking to control and direct royal patronage, leading knights and esquires in the South had their own influence and power based on their wealth and local standing.

Almost all the rebels had, among their forebears, associates of two of the most powerful courtiers, Cardinal Beaufort from the 1420s and his protegee William, duke of Suffolk from the

1430s until his death in 1450.¹ The network of Beaufort-Suffolk clients 'assisted' by their followers - Lord Hungerford in Wiltshire, the earls of Wiltshire, Salisbury and Warwick further west, Thomas Chaucer in Oxfordshire, the Bourgchiers and the Fiennes from the late 1430s in the South East, and in East Anglia, Suffolk himself - stretched across the South linking leading gentry at court and in the regions where they dominated the shrievalty, were peace commissioners and sat for their counties.²

Among those who profited in terms of local offices in the 1430s and 1440s through the agency of Devon, Hungerford and others were John Arundel, father and son (father and grandfather of the rebel Thomas Arundel), John Trevelyan (father of rebel) 'king's lieutenant' in Cornwall, John Nanfan (father of rebel), John St Lo (father of rebel), John Cheyney (father of rebel), Henry Trenchard and John Uvedale (grandfather of rebel).³ This was the pattern in

-
1. Cardinal Beaufort as chancellor was able to dispense valuable patronage which did not end with his resignation in 1426; through the 1430s his protege, William, duke of Suffolk, steward of the royal household, 1433-47, and chamberlain of England, 1447-50, also cultivated the gentry: see D.A.L. Morgan 'The house of policy: the political role of the late Plantagenet household, 1422-1485', in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. D. Starkey (London), 1987, p. 39.
 2. R.A. Griffiths describes 'partisan rule at court' beginning in 1424 with the absence of the dukes of Bedford and Gloucester from England. Beaufort monopolised proceedings and patronised the court gentry in the form of county offices which gave him 'a strong and steady grip' on local society throughout the South: Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, p. 82; see also G.L. Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort* (Oxford, 1988), p. 235: A number of Beaufort and Suffolk followers were kinsmen; Thomas, fifth earl of Devon had married Beaufort's niece, the sister of John, earl of Somerset; Chaucer was the Cardinal's cousin and father-in-law of Suffolk; for Hungerford, grandfather of the rebel and the first baron Hungerford see J. S. Roskell, *Parliament and Politics in Late Medieval England*, 3 Vols (London, 1981-3), Vol. 2, pp. 96, 105, 118, 122, 127; Harriss, *op.cit.*, pp. 72, 158.
 3. Assisted by power-brokers in the West, John Arundel of Bidford had married Chaucer's wife's sister, and his career was furthered through this link. Both Arundels were returned for the shire in 1422 and were sheriffs: Roskell, *op.cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 174; Harriss, *op.cit.*, p. 72. Patronage was certainly a two-way street and on Chaucer's death he was found to have held lands with his wife, the gift of John Arundel: C.C.R., 1429-35, p. 336. According to M. Cherry, John Trevelyan had offices on the scale of the greater aristocracy, made possible by the death of John Holand in 1447 and also of the earl of Huntingdon: Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', p. 267. The Lanherne Arundels and wider family members were sheriffs of Cornwall in 1422, 1426, 1432, 1437, 1443; Trevelyan in 1448; for Trevelyan see *Trevelyan Papers*,

the Central South, an area tended by court favourites who paved the way for established gentry such as Thomas Stonor, John Norris and Edmund Hampden.⁴ In the South East families such as the Bourghchiers and the Fienneses dominated the local scene and channelled Beaufort and Suffolk patronage into the region, advancing the interests of knights Sir Thomas Brown (father of rebel), the Guildfords, Roger and Thomas Lewkenor and the Hautes (all immediate kinsmen of rebels). In East Anglia, Suffolk's domain, the Brandons and Wingfields prospered through the agency of the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Oxford, Suffolk's rivals, until the late 1430s when the duke's power at court began to overshadow them.⁵

p. 63 and *passim*; John Nanfan was sheriff of Cornwall in 1439, 1450 and in Wiltshire in 1451; see M. Cherry, 'The Struggle for Power in Mid-Fifteenth-Century Devonshire', *Patronage the Crown and the Provinces*, ed. R.A. Griffiths (Gloucester, 1981), p. 125, and *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 22, 153; Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, p. 263 n. 10; St Lo was sheriff of Wiltshire in 1439: *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 153; John Cheyney, M.P. for Kent in 1449: Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 493, 633-4, 815 and Harriss, *op.cit.*, p. 72; for Trenchard and Uvedale, *ibid*, pp. 72-3; John Uvedale, grandfather of the rebel, was sheriff of Hampshire in 1414, 1419, 1422, 1426 and 1433; his son Thomas (father of rebel) was sheriff in 1438, 1447 and 1451; Trenchard in 1443: *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 55.

4. For Norris, Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, p. 303; dominating the office he was sheriff six times between 1437-48, and in Wiltshire, Worcestershire, Somerset-Dorset and Oxfordshire-Berkshire: *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 108, 123, 153, 158; Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 340-41; for Stonor, *ibid.*, pp. 82, 337; *Stonor Letterss*, Vol.1, p. xxii; he married Jane, probably the natural daughter of the duke of Suffolk: *ibid*; see also Wedgwood, pp. 814-5; Stonor was sheriff of Oxfordshire-Berkshire in 1423 and 1427 and M.P. in 1447, 1449-50. Edmund Hampden represented Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, was a sheriff and a J. P., see Wedgwood, p. 413, and Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 309 and 337.
5. Both Thomas and James Fiennes (the latter, grandfather of rebel Thomas and created a baron in 1447) had known Beaufort patronage from the mid-1430s; Sir Roger, a knight of the body to Henry V, was dominant in local politics and became treasurer of the household in 1439 and keeper of the wardrobe: Harriss, *op.cit.*, p. 324, n. 50; Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 284-5, 293 n. 48, 301, 332. James, prominent also in local affairs, was an able politician, a member of the King's household and a royal councillor: Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 285, 339-40; Harriss, *op.cit.*, p. 306, n. 1. Retiring from royal service in 1448, Sir Roger's sons Richard (who became Lord Dacre of the South) and Robert continued in service in the household and the counties, while Lord Saye's son, William, shared his father's prominence becoming a knight of the body at the age of twenty in 1448: Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 339-40, 370, n. 62. The Bourghchiers, John, Lord Berners, (father of rebel Sir Thomas) and his older brothers Henry, count of Eu and later earl of Essex, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury and William, Lord

But the leading gentry were also patronised by other prominent courtiers in the 1440s and 1450s, leaving no power vacuum after Suffolk's death in 1450. The Bourgchiers were well-connected through their half-brother, the duke of Buckingham, and their kinsman, Richard duke of York;⁶ while the Fienneses, particularly James, created Lord Saye and Sele, came to dominate the court circle with Saye second only to Suffolk in the late 1440s in terms of influence within the household.⁷ Courtiers such as Lord Moleyns and Bishop Aiscough patronised John Norris, Edmund Hampden, Thomas Stonor II and the Lewkenors (the latter also kinsmen of archbishop Kemp); Sir Thomas Brown also advanced by the above was in service as well to the dukes of Somerset and Exeter.⁸ In the South West Trevelyan knew the good offices of these dukes as well as of Buckingham, and - with John Arundel - also of the earl of Oxford. Hugh Courtenay was retained by his uncle, the earl of Devon; John Cheyney was patronised by Lord Saye and by his cousin, Lord Bonville, Devon's rival in the West for retainers and rewards;⁹ while Nanfan was an associate of Wiltshire and a retainer of Warwick along with Alexander Hody, Robert and Richard Harcourt, and Thomas Treffry - the last three also followers of the duke of York.¹⁰ Sir Baldwin Fulford (father of rebel) was fee'd by Exeter with whom Piers

Fitzwarin had all known Beaufort/Suffolk patronage and were well-placed in the household and intimates of the King: Harriss, *op.cit.*, p. 159. Sir Thomas Brown was sheriff of Kent in 1443 and M.P. for the county in 1445-6: Harriss, *ibid.*, p. 243; Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 294, n. 87, 633-4. The Guildfords were also court favourites and Edward Guildford, grandfather of Sir John, was sheriff in 1431 and 1438: *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 68. Sir Roger Lewkenor, Thomas's grandfather was claimant to the title of Lord Camoys: Harriss, *op.cit.*, p. 159; sheriff in 1439, his kinsman Thomas was sheriff in 1426 and perhaps 1450; Sir Roger was a J.P. and represented the county: W. D. Cooper, *op.cit.*, p. 89.

6. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 12; Richard's aunt, the countess of March was half-sister to the Bourgchiers, while Henry Bourgchier had married the duke's sister, Isabel in 1426: Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 668-9.
7. Griffiths, *ibid.*, p. 303.
8. For Lewkenor, Griffiths, *ibid.*, pp. 81, 91; for Brown-Somerset, Griffiths, *ibid.*, p. 290; for Henry Holand, duke of Exeter, Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 90-3.
9. *Trevelyan Papers*, p. 63; for Trevelyan-Exeter see S. J. Payling, 'The Ampthill Dispute: a study in aristocratic lawlessness and the breakdown of Lancastrian Government', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CIV (1989), p. 896; for Arundel-Trevelyan-Oxford, *C.C.R.*, 1447-54, p. 501; Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', p. 267; for Cheyney-Saye, Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 633-4; for Cheyney-Bonville, Griffiths, *ibid.*, p. 289. Cheyney was sheriff of Devon in 1453; for Courtenay, Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', p. 234.

Edgecombe was also associated; and John Crocker's father was aligned with Devon in his support for York in the early 1450s.¹¹

Influential in the regions, they furthered their contacts at court as members of the household, council and bureaucracy, and, as intimates of the King: John Nanfan, an esquire of the body by 1447 and chamberlain of the exchequer, John St Lo, also king's esquire by at least 1428, and Sir John Cheyney were royal retainers.¹² John Trevelyan was a king's esquire; Norris, a member of the King's household and an usher of the chamber by 1429, became keeper of the Great Wardrobe in 1444-6 and keeper of the Queen's jewels and finances, 1446-52.¹³ Roger Tocotes was a member of the household, while Sir Edmund Hampden, king's carver and usher of Margaret of Anjou's chamber at her coronation, became an esquire of the body to Henry VI like John Norris, and an official in the household of the Prince of Wales.¹⁴ Sir Robert Harcourt (father of rebel, John) and his brother Richard were in Suffolk's service in the 1440s and prominent at court through the 1450s, while Sir Thomas Brown was an exchequer clerk in the 1440s, under-treasurer by 1447 and Henry's councillor by 1453.¹⁵ Sir Robert Wingfield held a secure place in Henry's household and later in the household of the Queen.¹⁶

These were the families who confronted the King in 1483. As Richard absorbed the scope of the rising he was, no doubt, struck by the depth of the opposition: their wealth and local power, experience in administration and bureaucracy and their service at the highest levels to

-
10. For Nanfan, Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp.82-3; Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', p. 324, also Cherry, 'The Struggle for Power in Mid-Fifteenth-Century Devonshire', p. 125 ; Roskell, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 242, n. 43; Wedgwood, pp. 621-2; *D.N.B.*, Vol. XIV, p. 31; for Treffry, Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 278, 888; for Harcourts, I. D. Rowney, 'The Staffordshire Political Community, 1440-1500', pp. 102-6; Wedgwood, pp. 420-1; for Hody, Wedgwood, p. 461; for Treffry-York, *C.C.R.*, 1461-7, p. 43.
 11. For Crocker, Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', pp. 318-9; for Fulford, Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 53, and for Edgecombe, Gilbert, *op.cit.*, p. 450.
 12. For Nanfan and St Lo, Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 263, n. 10, 298; for Cheyney, Griffiths, *ibid.*, pp. 493, 633-4, 815; Harriss, *op.cit.*, p. 72.
 13. For Norris, Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 303, 341; Wedgwood, p. 637.
 14. For Tocotes, Wedgwood, p. 859; for Hampden, Wedgwood, p. 413; see also Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 367; Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, p. 309.
 15. For Harcourt, Wedgwood, p. 420; for Brown, Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 290, 293.
 16. Griffiths, *ibid.*, pp. 12, 35.

courtiers and kings. He was also aware of their military might which most had used to assist the King - but some, his opposition.¹⁷

A number of these, particularly from the West, who had been drawn into the court politics of the 1450s increasingly dominated by Margaret of Anjou, fought for the crown in 1459-60, and then resisted Edward IV in 1461; among them John Nanfan, John Trevelyan, Hugh Courtenay, John Willoughby, Alexander Hody, Baldwin Fulford, Piers Edgecombe, the Hungerfords and more who provided stiff resistance to York's challenge in 1459. In the conflict Sir Thomas Brown from Kent, Trevelyan and Fulford, had served the duke of Exeter; Crocker, Arundel and Courtenay, the earl of Devon; Nanfan, although a retainer of Warwick's father, supported Queen Margaret, along with Hampden, Norris, Willoughby and Latimer.¹⁸ Others like Treffry, William Twynyho, Sir Robert Harcourt and Thomas Stonor from Cornwall and Oxfordshire, respectively, and John Wingfield from Suffolk had aligned with York in the 1450s;¹⁹ again Sir William Courtenay and his father, Sir Philip (d. 1463), Sir Hugh's cousins and Bonville followers, assisted York in 1459.²⁰ There were many others including Wiltshire's Roger Tocotes and John Cheyney, and leading Kentish esquires John Fogge, John Scott, John Donne, Nicholas Gaynesford, John Guildford, Thomas Bourghier, Robert Poynings, Robert Fiennes, John Stourton and John Dinham (Fiennes and Stourton from baronial families, Dinham

-
17. From active military families, a number of these men had served abroad under Bedford, York and Somerset and could muster several hundred men; see *Extracts and Indentures* for early activity and A. Cameron, 'The Giving of Livery and Retaining in Henry VII's Reign', *Renaissance and Medieval Studies*, 18 (1974), p. 23, for later activity when gentry such as William and Walter Courtenay, John Hallwell, Crocker and the ennobled Thomas Courtenay, Lords Willoughby and Daubenay had substantial retinues.
18. For Piers Edgecombe, Gilbert, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 445; Edgecombe was a follower of the duke of Exeter and had married Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Holand.
19. Twynyho (d. 1472) was a close associate of John, Lord Stourton: *Wedgwood*, p. 888; for Harcourt, *Wedgwood*, p. 420; for John Wingfield, *Wingfield, op.cit.*, pp. 18-19, and see below, n. 43. ; Among Thomas Stonor's papers was an official Yorkist account of the first battle of St Albans, see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxiii and Vol.1, no, 59; Lord Cobham also aided York having been with him at Dartford in 1452.
20. Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', p. 236, n. 2; William had married Bonville's daughter and both father and son moved in the Bonville-Fitzwarin (William Bourghier) circle in the 1450s along with Sir John Dinham; the fracas at Clyst, Devon in 1455 was the outcome of baronial squabbles at the local level. Devon began a series of attacks on Bonville, Fitzwarin, Sir Philip Courtenay and members of their affinities, see Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', pp. 287, 322.

soon to be promoted) who had been solid crown servants yet who welcomed Warwick, March and Salisbury in 1460.²¹

Yet it was the recalcitrant West Country gentry, who, as Richard rode to Exeter, dominated his thoughts. Clearly in 1483 the King was most vulnerable here. Through his mother, Henry Tudor had substantial property entitlements in Dorset and elsewhere, while the Woodvilles had acquired a solid power-base in the region from the 1470s. Buckingham was obviously meant to serve as Richard's lieutenant in the South West, and had acquired important offices and rewards which gave him almost unprecedented power there. With the duke's defection, this region, so accessible to invasion from France and Brittany, was of major concern to the King both after the rising and for the rest of his reign. Led by disaffected nobles and often with French backing, the South West had a reputation for revolt. In 1485 Richard was to proclaim that 'Henry Tudor had plotted to allow foreign invaders to despoil the crown and realm';²² a sentiment which would have been shared by his brother who was well-aware of France's interest in supporting those at odds with the crown. Throughout the 'Yorkist' period the West, always through the agency of members of the Courtenay family, had often provided a spring-board for action against the crown. On a number of occasions Exeter had mustered forces for 'Lancastrian' dissidents who had secured support first from Charles VII of France and then his son, Louis XI, both of whom at strategic times, sought to embarrass Edward IV.

Even before Edward was crowned in March 1461, Margaret of Anjou summoned assistance here from active military families including the earl of Devon (the deceased cousin of rebel Thomas esquire), Robert, Lord Hungerford (father of rebel, Walter), and Alexander Hody, (uncle of William) who had fought at Northampton, all of whom fought at Wakefield in December, 1460. It was here that Hody was knighted by Devon, and went on to the second battle of St Albans, accompanied by Nicholas Latimer and John Heron. Before the victory, Sir Baldwin Fulford, Exeter's retainer and sheriff of Devon, asserted that 'on pain of losing his head, he would destroy the Earl of Warwick and his navy, if the King would grant him expenses', and assisted by his son, Thomas, and John Biconell who mustered his forces at

21. Dinham had offered Warwick, Salisbury and March assistance after the rout at Ludford; they stayed at his mother's home, Nutwell near Newton Abbot in south-east Devon and escaped in a vessel supplied by him: see 'Gregory's Chronicle', pp. 205-6; *C.P.*, Vol. IV, pp. 378-9; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 21, and n.3; Gillingham, *op.cit.*, pp. 104-5 and R. Pearse Chope, 'The Last of the Dynhams', pp. 437-8.

22. A. Goodman, *A History of England from Edward II to James I* (London, 1977), pp. 55-6.

Dartmouth, he took to sea with this in mind.²³ After St Albans Fulford and Hody who had marched south with the Queen, waited at Barnet while John Heron and others gauged the mood in the City. Hody with a contingent of four hundred fought again for Anjou with others such as Sir John Willoughby, and died soon after Towton.²⁴ Before long Devon had been executed and Fulford too, captured while seeking a fleet abroad; taken to Bristol he was executed by the King on 9 September 1461.²⁵

The Act of Attainder drawn up early in Edward's reign had indicted Courtenay and Hungerford, his son, Sir Robert, John Fortescue, John Heron, Nicholas Latimer, Alexander Hody, John Morton and many others.²⁶ The unrest continued however. Between 1461-4, the Queen and her principal councillors, Somerset, Exeter and Lord Hungerford actively campaigned for French support and Edward's fear of West Country disaffection backed by French assistance is manifest in his frequent commissions of array in the South West particularly in the summer of 1461 and early 1462.²⁷ For inciting rebellion John Arundel and John Trevelyan were the subject of commissions of arrest.²⁸ Edward urged the men of the South West to resist the French and raise a fleet at their own expense.²⁹ Not all complied: John Nanfan, who had fought at Blore Heath in 1459, was, as governor of Jersey, in a position to help the French take the island, which along with Guernsey had been granted to Pierre de Brez by Margaret of Anjou, and was seen as a base for invading French forces on behalf of the Queen.³⁰ In 1464, Thomas Fulford sought help from France (as his father had done) in the form of a fleet. Ironically, Sir Hugh Courtenay, whose piracy from 1461 antagonised the crown and

23. For Fulford, 'An English Chronicle', p. 85; Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 53, and for Biconell-Fulford, *Wedgwood*, p. 74.

24. 'Gregory's Chronicle', p. 217; Scofield, *op.cit.*, pp. 117, 145.

25. For Sir John Willoughby, *Memorials*, no. 314; Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 200.

26. Scofield, *ibid.*, pp. 219-20.

27. *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, pp. 28-31, 102 for commissions of arrest.

28. *C.P.R.*, 1461-7. p. 28, March, 1461. Associates of Exeter and Devon, Arundel and Trevelyan had been on numerous commissions of array in 1457-9. In June 1460, along with Devon and Sir Hugh Courtenay they were directed to arrest and imprison followers of the duke of York in Devon and Cornwall: *C.P.R.*, 1452-61, pp. 602-3, while as noted their own arrest was soon ordered for 'insurrection in the said county': *C.P.R.*, 1452-61, pp. 402, 407, 489, 495, 559, 613; *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 28.

29. *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, pp. 33-4, 38; Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 180.

30. Scofield. *ibid.*, pp. 42, n.3, 179, 480.

encouraged the French, was on a commission with William Treffry and others to array the men of Cornwall in response to the French threat.³¹

Yet Edward also had solid support in the West before his coronation from active knights such as Philip and William Courtenay, Thomas Treffry and John Dinham; while many including Richard Edgecombe, John Arundel's kinsman and namesake Sir John of Trerice, (d. 1473) his cousins, esquires Remfry and John Arundell, Sir John Colshull, Sir Maurice Berkeley of Beverstone, John Paulet esquire (father of rebel Amias Paulet), Thomas Uvedale, Sir Roger Tocotes, George Darrell and Thomas de la Mare also served the crown through the conflict and were encouraged by the King as their appointments to the shrievalty and the bench testify.³²

While much of the conflict involved West Country men, there were pockets of resistance elsewhere. In Buckinghamshire Sir Edmund Hampden remained disaffected. A follower of the duke of Somerset, Hampden ventured south with Margaret after St Albans to sound the mood in the City. After the defeat at Towton, he fled to Scotland and later to France with the Queen, the duke of Exeter, John Morton and Sir Edmund Montfort. On her behalf he visited Louis XI in 1462, remained in exile with her and died for her cause at Tewkesbury in 1471.³³ Others, however, had followed York in the 1450s and assisted his son in 1461. Sir Robert Harcourt was commissioned by Edward in May, 1461, with his younger brother, William, and his son, John to take the castles of Eccleshall and Stafford, and in November to guard Wallingford Castle, Berkshire. Created a knight of the garter in 1461, in 1464, Harcourt, at fifty-four was involved in the siege of Alnwick.³⁴ Sir Robert's brother, Richard, 'an old servant of the king's father', less of a soldier and more an administrator, was appointed sheriff (Oxfordshire-Berkshire) in

31. The following year he was again the subject of a commission for piracy relating to 1461: *C.P.R.*, 1452-61, pp. 612, 649-50; *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, pp. 36, 452, 488-9; *C.C.R.*, 1461-8, p. 148.

32. Dinham was sheriff of Devon in 1460; Remfry and John Arundel esquire were sheriffs of Cornwall (1461) and Devon (1464), respectively; Sir John Colshull was sheriff of Cornwall in 1466; Sir Maurice Berkeley was sheriff of Gloucestershire in 1463; John Paulet esquire and Thomas Uvedale, sheriffs of Hampshire in 1461 and 1463; Sir Roger Tocotes, George Darrell and Thomas de la Mare were sheriffs of Wiltshire in 1463, 1464 and 1465, respectively. Delamare had been sheriff of Oxfordshire-Berkshire in 1459: *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 36, 108; Richard Edgecombe was escheator in the early 1460s: *Wedgwood*, p. 291; for the service of Sir John Arundel of Trerice who was active on important commissions, *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, pp. 233, 389, 488, 561; Sir William Courtenay was involved in local government and received gifts of wine from Exeter: *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 330, while Sir Philip was a commissioner from 1461: *Memorials*, nos. 52, 285.

33. Scofield, *op.cit.*, pp. 241, 368.

34. *C.P.R.*, 1461-67, p. 34; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 411; Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 631; *Wedgwood*, p. 420.

November, 1460, represented the county and appeared on local commissions from 1461. Yet like Richard, Robert also had a full schedule in local politics, serving the crown as a commissioner, justice and sheriff from the 1440s.³⁵ Thomas Stonor II, also an associate of York in the 1450s, served his son in a military capacity in the early 1460s, and, in addition, was an apportioner of the subsidy in 1463, sheriff in 1465 and a peace commissioner.³⁶ Yet royal servants in the region who were less enthusiastic about the new regime also continued in service. The talents of William Norris, for example who had fought at Northampton for Henry in 1460, and was knighted prior to the battle, like those of his father in the 1440s and 1450s, were utilised by the crown.³⁷ With substantial local commitments from the mid-1460s, he had received his highest accolade - as knight of the body - by 1465.³⁸

In the South East where York had received sympathy from leading families such as the Bourgchiers in the 1450s, the most prominent gentry remained, and more became part of the household on Edward's accession. Thomas Bourgchier, at nineteen, became sewer to the King and in 1464, marshal of the marshalsea; by 1466 he had been created knight of the body.³⁹ John Guildford who, in January 1461, had arrayed for Kent against the Queen, attended Edward's

35. *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 108; *Wedgwood*, pp. 419-21; Sir Robert was sheriff of Oxfordshire-Berkshire in 1455, a J. P. in Berkshire from 1446-49, 1452-8 and 1460 until his death in 1470 and in Oxfordshire from 1452-58 and from 1460; he was also on most important commissions from 1442; Sir Richard was a J.P. in Oxfordshire from 1447-May, 1459 and from August 1460 to May, 1469; parker of Cornbury in May, 1461, he was again sheriff in 1466: *C.P.R.*, 1461-7, p. 7; *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 108; *Wedgwood*, p. 419; for Richard Harcourt's service to York see *Select Cases Before the King's Council 1242-1483*, ed. I.S. Leadam and J. F. Baldwin (Cambridge, 1918), p. 118, n. 24.

36. For Stonor, *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*; *Wedgwood*, pp. 814-5. For military service, see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxiii.

37. His relative Thomas Norris, an esquire of the household and serjeant-at-arms, along with Sir Thomas Stanley, had opposed York's journey through Wales from Ireland in 1450: *Wolffe, Henry VI* (London, 1981), p. 241. Yet Norris quickly obtained some of the offices his father had enjoyed such as steward of Cokeham and Bray: *Wedgwood*, p. 640.

38. Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', pp. 7-8; a J. P. in Berkshire from the mid-1460s, he became sheriff in 1468 and was selected for important commissions.

39. For Bourgchier support of York in 1453-4, Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 721-7. Griffiths makes the point that their political stance is not easily determined; kin of York and Buckingham, the Bourgchiers tended to be interested in moderation and conciliation more than confrontation: Griffiths, *ibid.*, pp. 727, 761-2, n. 64. For Thomas Bourgchier see Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', p. 7 and *Wedgwood*, p. 95.

coronation and received 40 marks later in the year for services rendered. Continuing his service in county politics he became controller of the household, privy councillor and was knighted around 1467.⁴⁰ Like Guildford, John Fogge also active in local politics through the 1450s, mustered in Kent for Henry VI, but opened up Sandwich to Salisbury, Warwick and March in June, 1460; knighted at Northampton, he fought at St Albans and then Towton for the new King. King's esquire under Henry VI, Fogge became treasurer of the household and keeper of the wardrobe in 1460, privy councillor and keeper of the writs in the following year.⁴¹ So too, by April 1461 Nicholas Gaynesford, appointed sheriff (Surrey-Sussex) in November 1460, was usher of the chamber and king's servitor. Like the above the crown was keen to tap his talents in court and county politics, much in evidence since the late 1440s. Sir William Haute, another king's servitor in 1461 was active in the South with his brother, Richard, a member of York's household, who defended the Tower for Edward.⁴²

East Anglian gentry such as William Brandon and his nephew John Wingfield had associated with York since 1449-50 when, after Suffolk's death, the earl of Oxford and the duke of Norfolk were able to attract a number of the late duke's clients. Brandon, active at home was busy at court and continued as marshal of the king's bench (held since 1457); already a servant of the household in January 1460, he became king's servitor in 1462. John Wingfield was admitted to the household and created knight of the bath on 26 June, 1461. In 1462 he rode north with the King and by 1463 he was a privy councillor with forty pounds per annum.⁴³

⁴⁰. Wedgwood, p. 402; Guildford received his reward in October, 1461. He had worked on Kent commissions from 1454, was sheriff in 1457 and on the bench from September, 1460.

⁴¹. Fogge was a J. P. in Kent from 1450 and sheriff in 1453; probably M.P. for Kent in 1461 and 1463, see Bolton, 'Sir John Fogge of Ashford', *passim*, and Wedgwood, p. 341. In 1460 leading gentry like John Cheyney were commissioned by the crown to resist the earl of Warwick in Kent 'late entered Sandwich', yet by February, 1461, most from the region supported Edward, some, like Robert Poynings, losing their lives: *Memorials*, no. 280.

⁴². Gaynesford was customer in the port of London in 1449-50, elector in 1453 for Surrey when an M.P. and represented the county in 1455 and 1460; an escheator in Surrey, he was on commissions from July, 1460 and on the bench from July, 1461; with all this he managed a career as a leading lawyer: Wedgwood, p. 368.

⁴³. Wingfield, *op.cit.*, pp. 13-15, 18-19; *Memorials*, no. 287; Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, p. 728. The son of Sir Robert Wingfield, John Wingfield had witnessed a charter granted on 18 March 1449 by York and was probably an annuitant at this stage; he supported York in 1453-4 and was sheriff of Norfolk-Suffolk in 1454, probably through York's influence. See in general M. Sayer, *op.cit.*, pp. 307-8, and Wedgwood, p. 102.

Families were sometimes divided in their loyalties during the upheavals, yet, as the discussion has already demonstrated, political differences seldom created long-term rifts. While John Wingfield had supported York and his son, his nephew Sir Henry, son of Sir Robert fought for Queen Margaret, was knighted at Northampton and attainted after Towton. Yet records indicate no division in the 1460s between the two.⁴⁴ Again, household servant, Robert Poynings (father of Thomas) was sent down into Kent to quash Cade's rebels, but ended up as sword-bearer and carver to Cade himself. It was left to John Fogge and others to suppress the rebels who had indicted his and Poynings's colleagues John Norris, Thomas Brown, Trevelyan, and others. Again these families were able to resolve conflict and cooperate in local and household administration. In fact Brown's son Sir George not only associated with Poynings's son, Edward, in the 1460s but had married his widow, Elizabeth Paston, by 1471.⁴⁵

It was cold comfort to Richard III in 1483 that notwithstanding these disaffected families the vast majority of the gentry in 1461 remained in service to the crown - service which, at times, was perhaps at odds with their sympathies. In their ability, however, to overcome division, the gentry were guided by the crown. Indeed it was not the crown's policy to crush its opposition, and few were ostracised, if not immediately taken back into public service. Sir Nicholas Latimer, for instance, was attainted after Towton, yet he attended Edward's coronation, was involved again with Margaret in the siege of Bamborough, yet was pardoned before the siege of Alnwick in April, 1464, swearing allegiance to the earls of Warwick and Worcester late in 1463.⁴⁶ Sir Hugh Courtenay, having aligned with the earl of Devon (d. 1460) and having caused the crown headaches from 1461, led a commission of array (as noted) in 1464.⁴⁷ In the South East, like Latimer, George Brown, whose father was beheaded for defending the Tower after Northampton in 1460, attended Edward IV's coronation. And while his father's attainder precluded his sons from enjoying their estates until 1468, Brown was not cold-shouldered and rose to prominence in the service of the duke of Clarence in the 1460s.⁴⁸ The best illustration, however, is that of Sir Walter Hungerford. In 1464 his father Robert, third Lord Hungerford was beheaded at Hexham and members of his family continued their

44. Wingfield, *passim*; see also R. Virgoe, 'An Election Dispute of 1483', *Historical Research*, Vol. 60 (1987), p. 35.

45. C.P.R., 1446-52, p. 386; Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 113.

46. See B.L. Add Ms, 6113, f. 19; Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 265. Latimer had received back some of his lands as early as 1464.

47. Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', p. 319; C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 489.

48. Scofield, *op.cit.*, pp. 90-3; Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 105-6; Wedgwood, p. 122.

disobedience; yet Walter was 'king's servant' by 1465 and an integral member of the King's household through the 1460s.⁴⁹

2. Crises and Rebellions, 1461-1471: Activity and Allegiance

The two dominant spheres of magnate control in southern England in the 1460s centered around the Mowbray duke of Norfolk and to a lesser degree John, duke of Suffolk and the earl of Oxford in East Anglia, and in the West Country around the earl of Warwick and increasingly, the duke of Clarence.⁵⁰

A number of leading East Anglian families had a tradition of service to Norfolk and Suffolk, many of whom had also known the patronage of Richard duke of York from 1450.⁵¹ The influence of the two dukes also spread throughout the Home Counties, where prominent knights and esquires, some connected with York, were also their clients. Both dukes had joined York by October, 1460, were present at the second battle of St Albans on 17 February and were at Towton on 29 March. Norfolk died in November, 1461 and his son, John, fourth duke obtained his lands on 23 March 1465, while John, duke of Suffolk, still a minor, had livery of his estates on 23 March, 1463. Through the 1460s Mowbray influence in East Anglia was strong and Norfolk exploited his alliance with Edward and his power within the region. For his part, Edward was sure of the duke's support on the national stage, the only hiccup occurring in 1468 when John Poynings, servant to the duchess of Norfolk was executed for his alleged treason at the time of Margaret of York's wedding to the duke of Burgundy.

Among the duke's chief supporters in Norfolk were his leading councillor, William Brandon, knights, John Howard and his son Thomas, Robert and John Wingfield and Robert Brewes.⁵² Other Mowbray supporters were Sir Humphrey Talbot, John Radcliffe, Sir Thomas

49. C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 243.

50. See in general, C. Ross, *Edward IV*; Sayer, *op.cit.*, pp. 305-313; Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 27-51.

51. Writers attribute Mowbray animosity to 'Lancaster' and support for 'York' as a product of the 1440s and the duke of Suffolk's power at court and influence within East Anglia; see Sayer, *op.cit.*, p. 305. For his part, Suffolk had married York's daughter, becoming brother-in-law to the King.

52. For Brandon and the Wingfields, Sayer, *ibid.*, pp. 307-8, and Virgoe, 'An Election Dispute of 1483', p. 35; for Howard, see above, Part 2, Chapters 3 and 4, *passim*; Robert Brewes had married Katherine, daughter of Sir John Wingfield (d. 1481) and had received a pension for service to the

Waldegrave, Henry Wentworth, John Heveningham, the Debenhams, Sir William Calthorpe and lesser men, lawyers such as John Timperley and Richard Southwell. There is no such list of Suffolk annuitants for the 1460s, yet Sir Robert and Sir John Wingfield, together with Sir Thomas Brewes were members of the duke's council, while others such as William Knyvet, and rising star John Risley were most probably associated - like most of the leading gentry - with both dukes.⁵³ Another player in East Anglian politics in the late 1460s was the brother-in-law of the earl of Warwick, John de Vere, thirteenth earl of Oxford. Imprisoned in 1468 and pardoned in 1469 he joined Margaret of Anjou in 1470, and was the main force in the region through the Readeption, supported by men such as Knyvet, Henry Heydon, John Paston and Richard Roos.

The influence of the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk reached the Home Counties where Richard Lewkenor and Nicholas Gaynesford were linked with Norfolk along with Berkshire's Sir William Norris, while the Poyninges were Suffolk associates. Oxfordshire's Thomas Stonor (whose father-in-law was most probably the late William, duke of Suffolk) and Richard Harcourt (families also formerly connected with the duke of York) also had ties with both dukes.⁵⁴ Indeed such was Harcourt's bond with Suffolk that in 1468 an observer wrote to

King and his father. The Wingfields were sons of Sir Robert (John being father of rebel John Wingfield) a former Mowbray retainer, but who became Suffolk's protege and well-placed in the household in the 1440s.

53. Sayer, *op.cit.*, pp. 307-9. Suffolk was without the drive of Norfolk and was never really a major player either in East Anglian politics or on the national stage as Norfolk or the earl of Oxford. For Suffolk's council see *Wedgwood*, p. 419. While Sir Robert was a Mowbray follower either he or his namesake gave some support to the Pastons in the Caister matter, against Sir William Brandon, see above, Part 2, Chapter 4; for support of Sir Robert and Sir Richard Harcourt by both dukes, albeit in 1472, *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1. no. 354; for Risely, Virgoe, 'Sir John Risley (1443-1512), Courtier and Councillor', p. 142. Sayer, *op.cit.*, pp. 311-2.
54. Suffolk's largest estates outside East Anglia were in Oxfordshire and Berkshire and it is not surprising that he had contacts with the leading gentry there through business and office-holding; he was a J. P. in both counties, see J.A.F. Thomson, 'John de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, *Speculum*, No. 54 (1979), pp. 534-5. By 1460 Poyninges, having married Elizabeth Paston, later the wife of Sir George Brown was closely associated with the duchess of Suffolk, Edward and Warwick, see *Paston Letters*, Vol. 2, nos. 609, 613; for Lewkenor and Gaynesford, Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, Appendix III; for Norris, Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', p. 7. For Stonor-Suffolk connection, see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxii. His son, Sir William Stonor was possibly the duke's godson: *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxvi. Sir Richard Harcourt was a member of Suffolk's council in the 1470s: *Wedgwood*, p. 419.

John Paston II that 'they intend to have a man of my lady of Suffolk's, sheriff, and especially Harcourt'. Sir George Brown of Surrey was also linked with Norfolk, Suffolk and the earl of Oxford in East Anglia, through his wife, Elizabeth Paston, widow of Robert Poyning.⁵⁵ He was also retained by the duke of Clarence along with Sir William Knyvet.

Yet Clarence's support in the 1460s came primarily from the West Country where the bulk of his estates lay, and where his territorial influence was most keenly felt, and from some who were also patronised by the earl of Warwick.⁵⁶ Among these were Sir Nicholas Latimer, Hugh Lutterell, Sir Robert Willoughby, James Norris, the Courtenays of Powderham, Sir Hugh Courtenay of Boconnoc, William and John Twynyho, their cousin, John Twynyho of Bristol, Roger Tocotes, John Halwell, Richard Nanfan, Thomas Fulford, Richard Edgecombe, John St Lo, Edmund Hungerford, Sir John Arundel of Lanherne, and probably Sir Thomas St Leger.⁵⁷ Many of these men were prominent in Clarence's household and on his estates; and with five receiverships, including Milton and Marden in Kent, Swaffham in Norfolk and the Courtenay and Montagu lands in the South West, his network of clients was extensive.⁵⁸ As Clarence built up his power-base in the region, for a time political society in the West centered on him as its greatest lay magnate. There were other spheres of influence, notably that centered around Humphrey Stafford, Lord Southwick, created earl of Devon briefly in 1469, which attracted his kinsmen, Robert Willoughby, John Colshill and others. Yet there was never too much competition; Clarence's power here was pre-eminent. Not surprisingly some of the duke's men were traditional Devon retainers such as Lutterell and Arundel, and almost all, particularly

55. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 354; Vol. 2, no. 752; *Wedgwood*, p. 419; see also Thomson, *op.cit.*, p. 539. Ross speculates that Brown's involvement with the duke in rebellion was perhaps sparked by 'bitter memories'; it is noteworthy however, that Sir George was steward of Clarence's Kent manors of Milton and Marden: Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 143; Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 175, and see below, pp. 17-18.

56. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 170.

57. For Latimer-Clarence connection, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 218, 346; *C.C.R.*, 1468-76, no. 962; for Courtenays, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 217; Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', *passim*; for the Twynyhos, Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 139; for Edgecombe, *Wedgwood*, p. 291; for St Lo, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 87; for Edmund Hungerford, Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, Appendix III; for Nanfan, Horrox, 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', Appendix I.

58. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 175.

baronial families such as the Hungerfords had held close ties for generations with the Courtenay earls.⁵⁹

The availability to Edward of such lavish patronage in the West transpired through a number of attainders in the early 1460s - the duke of Exeter, the earls of Devon and Wiltshire, and Robert, third Lord Hungerford - which along with the extinction of the baronies of Botreaux and Bonville altered the political complexion of the region. The depletion of the ranks of the old aristocracy and the redistribution of large blocks of estates brought the duke not only great wealth, but a local pre-eminence in the West through the 1460s, which, buttressed by Neville power, was formidable.⁶⁰ It also provided him with a sizeable, if amorphous, retinue. The duke's revolt with Warwick in 1470 brought together a number of these men, some of whom were active in the Lincolnshire revolt or who supported the rebels later in the year. Indicted in the West for their role in the rising were Sir Roger Tocotes, one of Clarence's main councillors, the five Powderham Courtenays and their cousin Sir Hugh Courtenay of Boconnoc. On 16 March 1470 Edward issued a commission to lords Dinham and Fitzwarin to arrest Sir Hugh and his cousins, along with John Sachefeld, John Netherton and Robert Sporeway.⁶¹ Sir Hugh defied the crown and 'assembled a great troop and army of all the friends he could make, and environing the city [Exeter], besieged the same'.⁶² Others implicated in the revolt include Thomas Fulford, William and John Twynyho, Richard Edgecombe, Nicholas Latimer and William Froste whose arrest was ordered on 8 February 1470.⁶³

Yet there were other leading gentry, also Clarence associates, who acted to quash the rebels. Commissions of array were issued to the West on 26 March 'for defence against George, Duke of Clarence, and Richard, Earl of Warwick, rebels', which included Viscount Lisle, lords Dinham and Fitzwarin, Sir Thomas Fulford, Charles Dinham, John Crocker, Henry Bodrigan, Sir John Arundel (of Trerice, and sheriff), Sir John Willoughby, his son Robert and John Biconell. Fulford's treason was soon apparent and he was replaced on new commissions issued on 17 April after Edward had arrived in Devon. Those added to the list to bolster the crown's

59. M. Cherry, 'The Courtenay Earls of Devon: The Formation and Disintegration of a Late Medieval Aristocratic Affinity', *Southern History*, Vol. 1 (1979), pp. 77, 94-6; Cherry, 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire, 1377-1461', p. 216, for Luttrell; for Arundel, *ibid.*, p. 217.

60. See above, Part 2, Chapter 4.

61. Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', p. 234; R. Pearse Chope, 'The Last of the Dynhams', p. 451.

62. Hooker, *op.cit.*

63. Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 22; C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 200.

strength include Gloucester, the earl of Wiltshire, Lord Mountjoy, Philip Beaumont, John Fortescue, Sir John Colshill and others.⁶⁴

While much of the disaffection was confined to this region, Clarence and Warwick were supported by Surrey knight Sir George Brown, arrested in April 1470 after Lincolnshire, and Sir John Guildford, lieutenant of the Cinque Ports under Warwick.⁶⁵ It is likely that despite their connections with Clarence (Brown was steward of the duke's lordships of Milton and Marden in Kent) both men were Warwick adherents. Guildford's role in events is interesting, and his support for the rebels not simply tacit. When Clarence arrived at Sandwich on 9 July 1469 in readiness for his marriage to Warwick's daughter, Guildford and Warwick greeted him with gifts. Later, when Clarence and Warwick crossed again to Sandwich on 12 July, having circulated their manifesto from Calais, their forces were swelled by contingents from Sandwich and elsewhere, including Sir John Guildford. Sir John's disaffection continued and his pardon on 5 March 1470 suggests implication in the Lincolnshire revolt at least.⁶⁶ Others from East Anglia who rebelled with the duke are William Knyvet and Richard Roos, whose lands were siezed on 25 April 1470 by Henry Grey of Ketteringham.⁶⁷

Those involved in Readeption politics include a broad spectrum of men: some actively engaged in sedition, others who promoted their own interests at this time, and more whose main concern was to facilitate stable government. Clearly, active followers of the rebel leaders received the choice offices: Knyvet, in league with Clarence and supported by Oxford (constable of England during the period), was sheriff and on the bench in Norfolk and Suffolk; Richard Culpepper became sheriff in Kent, while Brown was admitted as freeman to the city of Canterbury and John Guildford was appointed to the bench.⁶⁸ Sheriffs in the West pricked by Warwick and Clarence include Philip Courtenay in Devon, John Fortescue in Cornwall and Maurice Berkeley in Hampshire; for Somerset and Dorset, Sir Nicholas Latimer and in Wiltshire, Sir Roger Tocotes.⁶⁹ In Devon Sir Hugh Courtenay appointed to the bench along with his Powderham cousins, became a man of some note; receiving presents from the city of Exeter he was admitted to the freedom of the city on 17 December 1470, while on some

⁶⁴. Pearse Chope, 'The Last of the Dynhams', pp. 452-3; for Biconell, *Memorials*, no. 236.

⁶⁵. Wedgwood, p. 122.

⁶⁶. Kent A.O., CC/FA5, f. 76v for Warwick's support in Kent at this time and Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, p. 47; for Tocotes, *Memorials*, no. 329; for Latimer, see note 11.

⁶⁷. Sayer, *op.cit.*, p. 310.

⁶⁸. Wedgwood, p. 122.

⁶⁹. *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 22, 36, 50, 55, 124, 137, 143.

commissions his name appears next in line to Clarence and Warwick.⁷⁰ The Powderham Courtenays were also advanced, particularly Sir Philip, who, along with Sir John Arundel of Lanherne (Cornwall), Sir Nicholas Latimer (Dorset) and William Hody (Somerset), was appointed as peace commissioner in Devon in November 1470.⁷¹ Some such as John Halwell were removed from the bench during the Readeption suggesting either his or the rebels' reservations.⁷² Yet he appeared on other commissions in Devon and Cornwall with the above and more. Lawyer Michael Skilling of New Salisbury and Richard Edgecombe, were also active at this time, the latter paying for his service with the forfeit of his lands on Edward's return.⁷³

Clearly not all the duke's associates supported him in 1470 - reflected in the Readeption omissions. Some such as Sir Robert Willoughby, his kinsman Sir John Colshill, Henry Bodrugan and Sir Walter Hungerford either refused office or were dropped from the bench and vented their frustration through local conflict.⁷⁴ Hungerford's family - as noted - had played a key role in the earlier conflict and just recently Walter's brother was hanged at Bymerton with Henry Courtenay for his treason. Others omitted include Sir Thomas St Leger (in the East and West), John Arundel of Trerice, the Treffrys of Fowey and Sir John Crocker.

The pattern in East Anglia and the Central South is much the same as in the West Country. Followers of the earl of Oxford (and some of Mowbray) in league with Warwick and Clarence did well, including Knyvet and Roos (as noted), John Paston, Sir William Calthorpe, lawyers John Heydon, William Jenney, and more. Others, however, were out of favour, and while Norfolk and Suffolk remained on the bench, they, and a number of their clients, were in eclipse.⁷⁵ Mowbray supporters excluded in both Norfolk and Suffolk include William Brandon; Sir Robert Wingfield was dropped in Norfolk, while Sir John Howard, Sir John Wingfield, Thomas Wingfield, Gilbert Debenham (senior) and Sir Thomas Brewes were excluded in Suffolk.⁷⁶ The dukes' client Sir Richard Harcourt was also off the bench in Norfolk as well as

70. Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', p. 234.

71. Thomson, *ibid.*, p. 237; C.P.R., 1467-77, pp. 267, 628; for Hody, *Wedgwood*, p. 460.

72. Halwell was restored to the bench in March, 1471: C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 612.

73. C.P.R., 1467-77, pp. 251, 298; *Wedgwood*, p. 291.

74. In 1470 Richard Edgecombe was under attack from his neighbour across the Tamar, Sir Robert Willoughby, see *Memorials*, no. 31; for Bodrugan, A.L. Rowse, 'The Turbulent Career of Sir Henry de Bodrugan', *History* (1944), p. 20.

75. Both dukes had served Edward in the Lincolnshire campaign: M. A. Hicks, 'The 1468 Statute of Livery', *Historical Research*, Vol. 64, No. 93 (1991), p. 26; Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 90, 104, 108.

76. Sayer, *op.cit.*, pp. 311-13.

in Oxfordshire, along with his colleagues, Richard Croft and William Norris, who either forfeited or refused office.⁷⁷ Yet others served the crown: Thomas Stonor II retained his commission (Oxfordshire), along with Sir Edmund Rede (Oxfordshire) and Sir Thomas Delamare (Berkshire); still more such as Oxfordshire knights Edmund Hampden and Edmund Montford, abroad with Queen Margaret, took no part in Warwick's government and remained in exile until Tewkesbury in May, 1471.⁷⁸

Of all the regions, Warwick and Clarence found least support from leading gentry in the South East - Brown and Guildford being two important exceptions. Most of those who had made their mark in Edward's household, including John Fogge, Thomas St Leger, John Donne, John Scott, Richard and William Haute, Thomas Vaughan, John Gaynesford, Thomas Lewkenor and Thomas Bourghier, were either excluded from, or unavailable for, important local work. Sir John Fogge, Edward's most prominent captain, a leading courtier and a driving-force in the household had been targeted for attack in 1469 in Robin of Redesdale's manifesto, (devised by Warwick) where, with others, he was accused of 'mischevious assent and opinion' and of having undue influence over the King.⁷⁹ There was certainly no love lost between Sir John and Warwick. An integral member of Edward's household since his accession, Fogge's standing with the King was clear, and his frequent attendance at council meetings along with Vaughan and others aroused Warwick's ire.⁸⁰ Pre-eminent too in Kent, Fogge had locked horns with the earl when in 1465, along with twenty Kentish esquires he and Sir John Scott challenged Warwick's jurisdiction as constable of Dover.⁸¹ No doubt Fogge's negotiations with Philip of Burgundy in Flanders in 1467, exacerbated the ill-feeling as Warwick had been treating simultaneously with Louis XI. Altogether Fogge wielded too much power for Warwick. As treasurer of the household, he 'was to have the rank of an earl' when the steward was absent from court (with a twenty shilling per day allowance when touring himself!).⁸²

77. *Ibid*; *Wedgwood*, p. 640.

78. *Wedgwood*, pp. 413-4, 572, 602, 640, 711, 814-5.

79. The prototype of the manifesto was circulated in 1450 and used again in 1460; others included Earl Rivers, the earl of Pembroke, Humphrey Stafford, earl of Devon and Lord Audley: Scofield, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 492.

80. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 375.

81. Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', p. 9, n. 25; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 42-3; Fogge's importance as a captain is evident after Towton when he was in charge of the muster at Beverley, and had the 'rule of the Country' in Kent: Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 167, Vol. 2, p. 375; Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 35-6.

82. According to Ross, Fogge was treasurer, 1461-7, see *Edward IV*, pp. 323-4; for *Wedgwood* the dates are 1461-9: p. 339.

Not surprisingly Fogge led the resistance to Warwick and Clarence in 1469-70 along with other household men some of whom accompanied Edward during the tense period before his exile. On 9 July 1469, the day on which Sir John Guildford and Warwick presented Clarence with gifts at Canterbury, Edward at Nottingham with Robin of Redesdale's army bearing down, despatched Sir Maurice Berkeley and Sir Thomas Montgomery with letters to the duke, Warwick and the archbishop of York with orders to attend the King 'in such "persibil wise", as they have be accustomed...';⁸³ while after the Lincolnshire conspiracy, Edward's esquire John Donne carried his letters to Warwick and Clarence at Coventry on 13 March 1470.⁸⁴ Less than two weeks after the rebels' flight to France, Edward, expecting their return by way of Kent placed his most trusty captains in key positions and had appointed Sir John Scott as governor of Dover Castle on 24 April.⁸⁵ On 9 September, St Leger, apparently acting independently, urged the town of Salisbury to resist Warwick and Clarence, who had just docked in Devon.⁸⁶

During Edward's exile (September - March 1470-1) the household went to ground; Fogge, Gaynesford, St Leger, Debenham, Chamberlain and probably Haute and Risley along with others were abroad with the King; John, Lord Howard, Sir Thomas his son and the Lord Chamberlain's brother, Sir Ralph Hastings were in exile at Colchester. Some, like Thomas Bourghier were placed under arrest, while others, disconsolate, retired to their estates.⁸⁷ Edward's return was a tonic, acting as a unifying force among those who had resisted the Readeption, and others who had served in office during his exile. The King's strength in the East throughout the crisis is reflected in the support he received at both Barnet and Tewkesbury from nobles and gentry alike. On learning of Edward's return John Howard proclaimed him in Suffolk and with Lord Berners and their sons, greeted him in London with their retinues, while the duke of Norfolk having slipped away from the capital, arrayed in East Anglia.⁸⁸ Present among the gentry at Barnet on 14 April, Easter Sunday, 1471 were knights, Thomas Howard, Thomas and Humphrey Bourghier, Sir John Scott, Thomas Vaughan, undoubtedly Sir John Fogge, Richard Haute, the Gaynesfords and more, along with Berkshire's Sir William Allington, Sir William Norris and Sir William Stanley (the latter

83. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, pp. 7-8.

84. C.R.B.L., pp. 10-12; Warkworth, p. 8; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 14.

85. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 30.

86. Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 154.

87. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 72; Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', p.11; *Memorials*, no. 297; for St Leger, Wedgwood, p. 736.

88. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 766.; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 68; Sayer, *op.cit.*, p. 313.

two joining the King at Nottingham with Hastings's retinue some three thousand strong raised in the Midlands) all of whom presented at Barnet for the King.⁸⁹

Yet it was at Tewkesbury just three weeks later on 4 May, that Edward really won the day. Clarence's volte-face in early April, and Warwick's death at Barnet, along with the defeat of Anjou and the death of Lancaster at Tewkesbury ended the hopes of the rebels; the disruptive forces at work through the 1460s were finally laid to rest. It was from this point that Edward was able to consolidate; always sure of his power in the South East, it was at Tewkesbury that the Mowbray interest showed the depth of its support, while powerful West Country gentry, many of whom were Clarence retainers, a number disaffected through the 1460s, were now behind the crown. The strength of the King's position is reflected in his rewards to the victors in the form of knighthoods, grants and offices. The Mowbray followers did well. Those knighted at Tewkesbury include Brandon, Thomas and Henry Wingfield and Henry Grey, Norfolk's brother-in-law.⁹⁰ Later in the year Sir John Wingfield became sheriff, while those excluded from Readeption commissions were restored. Sir Richard Harcourt and Sir Robert Wingfield were selected to represent the shire in 1472 as both dukes 'were agreed', while Brandon and Chamberlain were selected for Suffolk.⁹¹ Even the vanquished were treated well: Knyvet, Roos, Henry Heydon, William Paston, Sir John and his brother John Paston along with Sir Henry Wentworth and others were pardoned late in 1471. Knyvet in fact sat for Melcombe the following year and was a knight of the bath by 1475.⁹²

In the South East as elsewhere the King was keen to show his gratitude: John Fogge, recouping his many offices was granted numerous forfeited lands.⁹³ Thomas Lewkenor, whose uncle, Sir John had died at Tewkesbury, was appointed to the bench in June, 1471 along with St Leger, sheriff of Surrey-Sussex in 1471 and Richard Gaynesford, sheriff there in the following year and member for Guildford; in addition St Leger received the castle of Rochester at this time.⁹⁴ Thomas Bourghier, elected for Surrey in 1472, also received grants and stewardships, while Walter Hungerford, having avoided the conflict, became lieutenant of Dover in 1472 with Scott.⁹⁵ Even Sir John Guildford was dealt with leniently. Losing his pension in 1471,

89. *Memorials*, nos. 145, 184, 188; Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury*, p. 61.

90. *Memorials*, no. 203.

91. *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, no 354; Sayer, *op.cit.*, p. 314; see also R. Virgoe 'Three Suffolk Parliamentary Elections of the Mid-Fifteenth Century', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIX (1966).

92. Sayer, *op.cit.*, p. 314.

93. *Wedgwood*, p. 341.

94. *Memorials*, no. 313, for Lewkenor; *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 137; *Wedgwood*, p. 736.

95. For Bourghier, see above Part 2, Chapter 4, and *Wedgwood*, pp. 95, 486.

Guildford was pardoned in May of that year and quickly regained his former positions on the bench and at court.⁹⁶ In the Central South, Richard Croft was knighted after Tewkesbury, while families such as the Norrises and Harcourts who had lost positions during Edward's exile, together with those who had remained in service throughout such as the Stonors and Redes, continued to prosper.⁹⁷ In the South West good service to the King also brought rewards in local government to royal servants including John Biconell and Sir Robert Willoughby, the latter promoted to the bench while the former became sheriff of Somerset and Dorset in 1472.⁹⁸ Those marked out for knighthoods after Tewkesbury include Henry Ferrers of Peckham, Kent (along with brother, John, of Staffordshire) and from the West John Newton and John Crocker.⁹⁹

Yet Edward was most generous with Clarence's men who had supported the duke in revolt, and then followed him into service at Tewkesbury: Sir Roger Tocotes, Sir George Brown and Sir Nicholas Latimer became bannerets;¹⁰⁰ the latter remaining as sheriff in Dorset, while Brown, pardoned in 1471, became an elector for Surrey in 1472 when he represented Guildford; soon back on the bench in Kent, he promptly regained his former standing in the household - and with Edward.¹⁰¹ Sir William Courtenay who, with his brothers, fought with Clarence at both Barnet and Tewkesbury, was named on a commission of array between the battles and became a justice of the peace on Edward's first commission in Devon.¹⁰² A counsellor to Edward IV, Peter Courtenay, bishop of Exeter was appointed in November, 1471 as deputy to the chief butler of England in south-west ports, while active as well in local administration - like the other Powderham Courtenays.¹⁰³ John Halwell continued on the bench, as an escheator in Cornwall and an elector in Devon;¹⁰⁴ while even a so-called 'Lancastrian die-hard' such as Sir John Arundel of Lanherne who fought for Margaret of Anjou at Tewkesbury, was pardoned in July

96. Wedgwood, p. 402.

97. Thomas Stonor, for example, prominent in Readeption politics was on a commission of array between Barnet and Tewkesbury: *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxiii; for Croft, *Memorials*, no. 141.

98. *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 610 for peace commission, and for other local work, pp. 399, 427, 464, 491-2; *Memorials*, no. 31.

99. *Memorials*, nos. 283, 277.

100. *Memorials*, nos. 329, 404; Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 631.

101. Wedgwood, pp. 121-2.

102. Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', p. 238.

103. Thomson, *iibd.*, p. 231 and *passim*.

104. *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 612.

1471, and with his cousin, Sir John of Trevice was active in local politics, despite his debt of 6000 marks to the King, still owing at his death in 1476.¹⁰⁵

In the West, Sir Thomas Fulford like Sir Hugh Courtenay, one of the few not to accompany Clarence to Tewkesbury, kept officials busy by stirring rebellion in Devonshire. Simultaneously in the South East, Fogge, St Leger, Scott, Haute and Bourgchier were active in subduing the last pockets of resistance under Fauconberg.¹⁰⁶ Fogge who had headed a commission of array in Kent on 18 April, between Barnet and Tewkesbury was again selected to array the county and confront the Bastard, and in May both he and Sir Richard Haute were among those defending the City against Fauconberg's onslaught.¹⁰⁷ In late May and early June Edward also deployed his most reliable captains in Kent: St Leger at Rochester, Scott at Sandwich and the earl of Arundel at Dover.¹⁰⁸ Again it was Fogge, who with Lord Dinham and Sir Thomas Bourgchier, shouldered most of the investigation into Fauconberg's revolt in Essex and Kent.¹⁰⁹ Yet it was Gloucester who took the prize, finally capturing Fauconberg at Southampton, after weeks of piracy and sedition.

The King's desire to reward his supporters and to win over former dissidents was not new - and Edward could afford to be generous. Sure of his power in the South East since his accession, the men who controlled the regions as power-brokers were also his household servants. Comfortable too with the East, he had been ably assisted by Norfolk and Suffolk, and the powerful Mowbray affinity had shown itself fully committed to the regime. Importantly the West Country, long a hotbed of sedition and the region which had proved most difficult to subdue, had given encouraging signs at Tewkesbury that faction might now have given way to solid support for the crown. For decades fragmented, and with numerous and competing power circles, doubtless Edward hoped that with Clarence supreme and Warwick dead the South West would experience a unity which had long evaded it.

The discussion has demonstrated that the gentry in the Home Counties, especially Edward's household knights and esquires, were most committed to the King through the period of unrest. Many here had welcomed him as the earl of March in 1460, and supported him as the

¹⁰⁵. C.P.R., 1467-77, pp. 267, 609-10.

¹⁰⁶. Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 200.

¹⁰⁷. Richmond, 'Fauconberg's Kentish rising of May 1471', p. 689.

¹⁰⁸. Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 2; B.L. Stowe Ms 440, f. 68v.

¹⁰⁹. Scofield, *op.cit.*, p. 12; *Memorials*, no. 141; *Wedgwood*, pp. 399-400.

new King in 1461. The majority of West Country and East Anglian gentry had also served the crown through the conflict. Yet in both regions where powerful magnate rivalries operated, leading gentry were at times drawn into the central conflict, evidenced not just by their 'active' commitment, but by their exclusion from, or promotion to, local government offices at critical times. Yet again, many who were closely identified with a particular patron managed to avoid 'activity' of either sort, and 'lay low' through the period. Of course it is difficult to establish whether the knights and esquires who served the crown throughout the crisis of 1469-71, were, in fact, proteges of the dissidents who exploited the situation to their advantage; or, likewise, whether those who 'went to ground' were making a clear statement for the crown. What is apparent, however, is the lack of support Warwick received from gentry most closely identified with Edward's household; men with a long tradition of service, largely based in the South East but from the other regions as well. Yet it may also be argued that the majority of their colleagues who served in Readepton politics, maintained the tradition, promoting continuity in government at the local level, which was recognised and well rewarded by Edward IV.

CHAPTER 9

CONSOLIDATION - 1471-1483

The crisis of 1469-71 marked a turning point in Edward's reign; not simply because a disconsolate Warwick and a disloyal Clarence came close to toppling his regime. When Edward arrived back in England in March 1471, after six months in exile, it seemed as if good fortune had arrived with him; not just in the form of solid support from his servants, but in a spirit of optimism and with a clarity of focus not present in the 1460s. Edward had seized the initiative in 1461 when, as a young man he had captivated London and taken the crown. Ten years later again he seized the initiative, and after having installed himself once more in Westminster, he planned his strategies for victory over Warwick. Assisted by Clarence's return to the fold, he knew that Warwick's government with the pathetic Henry VI as figurehead had had many powerful critics. The earl had made too many errors of judgement - in patronising his kin to the exclusion of others, creating a Neville pre-eminence comparable with their position in the early 1460s; and in aligning with Louis XI against Charles of Burgundy which forced the latter to back Edward.¹ The death of Warwick at Barnet, the defeat of Margaret, the death of her son at Tewkesbury followed by Henry VI's own death, gave Edward a free hand to reorganise the kingdom; the crises were over and the business of consolidation about to begin.

While Edward could feel well-pleased with his support in the South in 1471, he could not be complacent. Only too aware of the problems which could arise from a narrow power-base and land-hungry nobles, from 1471 he set about redefining the boundaries of regional authority. His goals in 1461 had been conditioned by the need to 'live of his own' and 'to set a perfect love and rest among the lords of this land, to the entent that they may draw directly together in one union and accord in that may be sown to the honour, prosperity and welfare of the King our sovereign lord and the politic and restful rule and governance of this his land and people'; and both his household and regional policies were geared to this end.² In terms of the latter, as early as 1461 Edward began the task of redistributing political power at both the county and regional level, and of 'shaking up' traditional loyalties by placing servants, hand-picked, in the regions: the Nevilles in the North, the Herberts in Wales and the Marches and Hastings in the Midlands; lords Ferrers, Stafford of Southwick and Audley with Clarence and Warwick in the West; in East Anglia and the South East, Norfolk and local leaders such as John Howard, Fogge, Scott and others. For D.A.L. Morgan Edward had only limited success with his

1. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 101-4; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 154.

2. Morgan, 'The House of Policy', pp. 55-6; Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', pp. 18-19.

territorial policy in the 1460s and he cites Warwick's attack on the King's servants in 1469 as evidence. Redesdale's manifesto, according to Morgan, was not so much an attack on Edward's influential household men, as an attack on those whose power had accumulated in the regions; regarded as upstarts with too much patronage and local influence, a number had fought for Edward and most had been ennobled by him in 1461.³ On the other hand, the King *had* tried to conciliate major powers - Henry's former servants - early in the decade: Sir Ralph Percy, Sir Humphrey Neville, Somerset, Oxford and William, Viscount Beaumont; his limited success with these men helps explain why Edward concentrated great power and authority in the hands of so few.

The aim of the King's new territorial policy in the early 1470s was to broaden his power-base through a policy which would absorb the established patterns of local lordship, and, in so doing, strengthen the Yorkist regime.⁴ Central to his scheme of regional restructuring were members of the royal family, and in particular, the Woodvilles. Between 1471-5 Clarence and Gloucester split between them Warwick's forfeited lands, enabling Gloucester to consolidate in the North where the Percies were also favoured having been restored to the earldom of Northumberland. In the north-central Midlands Edward's chamberlain, Lord Hastings became pre-eminent, while Thomas, Lord Stanley, the new steward of the royal household, became regional leader in Lancashire, and his brother, William received a solid slice of power in Cheshire and north-east Wales. In fact, in Wales, the Marches and the South West, significant changes in government were made which transformed the regions. Between 1472-4 an extensive unit of regional government was based on the Prince of Wales's council at Ludlow, which also incorporated Wales and the West. Designed to combat marcher lawlessness in the face of permanent royal authority, this unit of power was also assimilated into Edward's scheme of 'land-based lordship'. Edward steadily increased the nominal authority of the Prince in these areas, and it was the Woodvilles, particularly Earl Rivers as head of his council, who now acquired a large slice of regional authority.⁵

In 1472 Rivers replaced Hastings as receiver-general of the duchy of Cornwall; in 1473 he became governor and ruler of the Prince's household and in 1476 he became the boy's steward.⁶ The composition of the council showed the King's hand in strengthening Woodville power. In 1471 it had included the Queen, Clarence and Gloucester, Rivers, Hastings, Lord Dacre, and

3. Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', p. 9.

4. Morgan, 'The House of Policy', pp. 64, 67.

5. Morgan, *ibid.*

6. D. E. Lowe, 'Patronage and Politics: Edward IV, the Wydevills and the council of the Prince of Wales, 1471-83', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, Vol. XXIX (1981), pp. 551-3.

Woodville associates, Fogge, Sir John Scott and Sir Thomas Vaughan, who became the Prince's chamberlain in 1474. In 1473 Edward increased the council to twenty-five adding the earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Ferrers (with whom the Woodvilles were distantly connected) and other of the family's clients such as Richard Haute.⁷ Ten years later on 25 February, 1483, Edward revised the ordinances of 1473 which detail the Prince's household officers: Sir Richard Grey, councillor, Earl Rivers, governor, Vaughan, chamberlain, Sir William Stanley, steward, Sir Richard Croft, treasurer and Richard Haute, controller. In this way Edward confirmed and increased the influence of the Woodvilles in the Prince's affairs.⁸ All the new appointees were Woodville associates and it is probable that the Queen's sons, the marquis of Dorset and Sir Richard Grey, and her brother Edward Woodville were also members of the council through their involvement in his affairs.⁹ In addition, the duke of York's councillors included Dorset and Thomas Vaughan, while his feoffees included the Queen, Dorset and Rivers.

What in fact Edward had created at Ludlow was a second court with servants whose allegiance was to the Prince. Not a rival court vying for power with Westminster, but a separate royal household in which the Prince became the object of his servants' ambition and loyalties, and to whom they looked for advancement.¹⁰ Vaughan and Croft took up residence with the Prince, while Haute spent much of his time at Ludlow. The Stanleys, supreme in the Prince's earldom of Chester, had most to fear from the council. Their answer was to enter service, and Sir William and his nephew George Stanley were well patronised, the former appointed as steward of the Prince's household by 1483. The powers which devolved on the council were great. Rivers was able to place men within a number of the Prince's estates and to influence local political offices. Their strength was further realised at the muster, and when in 1482-3 Rivers could raise three thousand men in Wales, and Stanley four thousand more, an enormous power-base had been created.¹¹

Inevitably there were casualties in the new regionalism, the most significant of whom was Henry, second duke of Buckingham. Involved in the formalities of courtly life and attendant on the King during periods of conflict, from almost the time that Buckingham was granted livery

7. N. Orme, 'The Education of Edward V', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LVII, No. 136 (1984), p. 122; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 366, 414.

8. Orme, *ibid.*, p. 124; for Croft, D. E. Lowe, 'The Council of the Prince of Wales and the Decline of the Herbert Family during the Second Reign of Edward IV (1471-1483)', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, Vol. XXVII (1977), p. 278.

9. Lowe, 'Patronage and Politics', pp. 557-60; *C.P.*, Vol. XII, p. 356.

10. Hicks, 'The Changing Role of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', p. 78.

11. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-9.

of his lands early in 1473 he had been refused most offices that 'the young head of an old magnate family might have expected'.¹² Edward, it may be said, appointed Buckingham steward during Clarence's trial in 1478, and allowed him to assume the arms of Thomas of Woodstock, the duke having 'ascended to a coat near to the King and of his royal blood'; he also granted him a royal manor, part of the Bohun estates, along with a conversion in 1478 of his Newport manor to a grant in tail male.¹³ Yet in a political context, Buckingham was a nonentity. Excluded from the commissions of the peace in all counties except Stafford, the duke, having contracted to go to France in 1475 was absent from the King's army. Moreover his lack of political favours went hand-in-hand with Edward's refusal to grant him the other slice of the Bohun inheritance for which he had repeatedly petitioned through the 1470s. Buckingham, in possession of half these estates from his great-great grandmother, Eleanor de Bohun, comprising lands in the Welsh marches, the South East and the Midlands, was repeatedly refused his claim to the other half. Scattered across southern England, the estates had passed from Eleanor's sister, Mary, to her son Henry V, and on the deaths of Henry VI and his son in 1471, to Henry, duke of Buckingham.

Much has been made of the duke's exclusion from power both at court and in the regions. C. Rawcliffe notes that while the first duke was favoured by lavish royal patronage, the second duke 'received no such favours from Edward IV', because 'the latter's insecurity on the throne made him innately suspicious of the Staffords' royal blood and their traditional expectations of a share in the business of government'.¹⁴ Further, she notes that implicit in Buckingham's assuming the arms of his great-great grandfather, Thomas of Woodstock, son of Edward III, was his claim to the throne. Doubtless, Edward, well aware of Buckingham's descent, exercised caution in the matter of his inheritance. So too, he was most probably influenced by financial considerations since this share of the Bohun estates realised over £1000 a year.¹⁵ Buckingham was not the only casualty in this restructuring. The second earl of Pembroke was virtually dispossessed, and it would be rash to assume that the duke had been singled out for ostracism. However, in view of his substantial holdings in south-east Wales, the Marches and the South West, Buckingham may well 'have had cause to resent his cold-shouldering by Edward IV'.¹⁶

12. See below, Part 4, Chapter 13 for a discussion of Buckingham's exclusion from court positions under Edward IV.

13. Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', pp. 18-19. The royal manor was 'Cantref Selyf', while the duke's lease of the manor of 'Ebbw' was changed to a grant in tail male.

14. Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, p. 1.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-1.

16. Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 334-5.

The gentry, however, were little affected by these changes in the years immediately following Tewkesbury, and patterns of patronage altered little. Few were penalised for disaffection and members of leading gentry families either took up royal service or continued much as before. In the South West, Clarence remained pre-eminent and the gap left by Henry Stafford, Lord Southwick was soon filled by John, Lord Dinham, Lord Stourton and powerful esquires of the body Thomas St Leger and Thomas Bourghier whose influence derived largely from their acquisition of confiscated estates and offices within the duchy of Cornwall.¹⁷ In East Anglia, the duke of Norfolk (d. 1476) and John, Lord Howard and his son, Sir Thomas were King's lieutenants, while in the South East leading household and county gentry managed the region, supervised by the King, much as their fathers and grandfathers before them. The disinclination of the earls of Kent and Arundel to enter into the political arena, the gentry's own power there and their 'direct line' to court, encouraged this situation.¹⁸

Yet it was the Woodvilles who came to dominate political life throughout the South and further afield in the 1470s. Well-connected among the nobility mostly through their matches in the 1460s, they counted among their affines the Greys of Ruthin and the Ferrers of Groby. The duchess of Buckingham, the countess of Pembroke and Lady Strange, were all sisters of the Queen, while two other sisters married the heirs of the earls of Kent and Arundel. Early in 1471 John, Lord Grey of Powys married Anne, sister-in-law of the countess of Pembroke; Katherine (d. 1483) dowager duchess of Norfolk was the widow and executrix of Sir John Woodville (d. 1469), while Lord Dudley was father of the Queen's chancellor, William Dudley. Another distant relative was Lord Hastings, and by 1479 other marriage ties included Thomas Lord Stanley, whose son's mother-in-law, was Jacquetta, Elizabeth Woodville's elder sister. The Woodvilles were also connected - albeit tenuously - with Lord Ferrers, the earl of Shrewsbury and Viscount Lisle. Leading gentry were part of this kinship network including the Hautes, first cousins of Elizabeth Woodville, and Fogge (who had married Alice Haute) while Vaughan's wife, Eleanor, was a cousin of the earl of Arundel, whose heir had married the Queen's sister, Margaret Woodville.¹⁹

As the Woodvilles rose to prominence in the regions, Clarence's servants continued to prosper, men such as Norfolk knight William Knyvet and William Paston, Kent's Sir George Brown, Sir Roger Tocotes, Sir Nicholas and John Latimer, Sir William Courtenay and John

17. Morgan, 'The House of Policy', p. 65.

18. Lowe, 'Patronage and Politics', p. 550; A. J. Pollard, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 99; Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', pp. 18-19.

19. Hicks, 'The Changing Role of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', pp. 63, 71; Lowe, 'Patronage and Politics', pp. 552, 557-8, 560; for Strange see also *C.P.*, Vol. XII, p. 356.

Twynyho junior, all of whom were present in the parliament of 1472-5.²⁰ There was, however, a shift away from Clarence from around 1473, when a number of his clients broadened their political contacts. This is evident in the parliament of 1478, when, after the duke's death Woodville influence predominated. Yet Stafford patronage is also evident and, although at this stage lacking the political clout of Woodville lordship, many prospered in the 1470s through the agency of the dowager duchess Anne, and later her grandson, Henry, duke of Buckingham. Brown, a knight of the body, represented Surrey. Connected with both families, he was by now almost exclusively Edward's servant and one of those 'great about the king's person'.²¹ Knyvet sat for Bletchingly (Surrey), in the gift of the Staffords, and having distanced himself from Clarence had moved into Buckingham's sphere through his marriage to the duke's great-aunt, by 1475.²² By this time his colleague, Sir Nicholas Latimer was also in service to Buckingham as his chamberlain, while William and Sir John Paston assisted by Stafford and Woodville connections sat for Bedwin (Wiltshire) and Great Yarmouth (Norfolk) respectively.²³ John Rushe, either through his patrons Earl Rivers or Sir John Paston also represented Great Yarmouth, and, in passing, was a client of Lord Stanley, Sir William Stonor and Henry, duke of Buckingham.²⁴ John Twynyho senior (Gloucestershire), attorney-general to the Prince of Wales, also moved somewhat from Clarence's circle in the early 1470s; Buckingham's servant, yet his main patronage was Woodville based.²⁵ Tocotes too, broadened his political contacts becoming a Woodville retainer in 1473 and received offices at Devizes (Wiltshire) in the Queen's gift.²⁶ An exception to the above, Sir Philip Courtenay, remained close to Clarence and quiet in public, although his brother John esquire, the king's servant and a former Clarence retainer, sat for Devon in 1478.

20. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, Appendix III.

21. Wedgwood, p. 121; for quotation, Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', p. 9.

22. Joan was the daughter of Humphrey, first duke of Buckingham. Buckingham had visited Knyvet at Buckenham in 1478: *Paston Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 312; Virgoe, 'An Election Dispute of 1483', p. 32, n. 45.

23. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, Appendix III.

24. See above, Part 2, Chapter 5 for Rushe and below for Earl Rivers's patronage of Rushe; as noted he was attainted at Brecon with Buckingham in 1483; see also C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1002, for an indenture between Rushe and Stonor in July, 1482, concerning lands sold by the latter to Rushe in Suffolk; he was also connected with Richard Croft, John Norris, Sir Thomas Delamare, William Paston and Thomas Lovell: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 247; *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, no. 726.

25. See above Part 2, Chapters 3 and 4.

26. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, Appendix III.

By 1478 Woodville influence reached many more than the servants of the dead duke, and included a number of young knights and esquires in the South, assisting them with offices in county administration and posts at court. Those with long records of service were patronised as well as younger men, gentry who had come into their own in the regions since the conflict of 1469-71, among them Thomas Lovell, Sir William Brandon's sons, William and Robert, and Sir John Wingfield's son John, in East Anglia; in the South East Sir Thomas Lewkenor, Fogge's son John, Richard Guildford and Edward Poynings; William Stonor in the Central South and William Berkeley, John St Lo, John Cheyney, Giles Daubenay, Richard Nanfan, William Uvedale, Edward Courtenay and Thomas Arundel in the South West. The latter were patronised by Dorset, who, in 1474 and as the earl of Huntingdon, began to consolidate his power-base in the West. In 1473 Dorset's marriage to Anne Holland brought him estates in the region, which he retained after her premature death.²⁷ In 1474 his marriage with Cecily Bonville, heiress to the Bonville and Harrington estates and a stepdaughter of Lord Hastings took place, and in the following year he received the marquissate.²⁸ From this time Dorset's main estates and major concerns were in the South West, reflected in his local offices. On all important commissions, he administered the lands of the Queen and of the duchy of Cornwall.²⁹ Leading gentry were quick to benefit. In Somerset Sir Giles Daubenay, at twenty-three, obtained numerous offices from 1474 and later in the decade was a justice and sheriff in Devon, Somerset and elsewhere, and with Dorset's help, sat for the county in 1478.³⁰ Others promoted include Sir Robert Willoughby and Richard Nanfan, sheriffs of Cornwall in 1478 and 1479; William Berkeley and William Uvedale, (the latter just twenty-five in 1479) sheriffs of Hampshire in 1476 and 1479 (the former sheriff also of Somerset-Dorset in 1477), John Cheyney and Walter Hungerford, sheriff of Wiltshire in 1479. J.A.F. Thomson notes that Edward Courtenay, quiet after Clarence's death, might well have suffered through association with the duke. Thomas Arundel could also fit into this category. Yet if this is the case, neither man (both of whom were active earlier) suffered total or permanent eclipse: Courtenay who was a commissioner in 1477 and sheriff of Devon in 1478, and Arundel, who had received the wardship and marriage of Charles Ringwood in 1479, rose to great heights in the early 1480s. Thomas St Leger and Humphrey Bourghier who had also known Woodville patronage by 1478, were themselves power-brokers within the region.³¹

27. Hicks, 'The Changing Role of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', p. 73.

28. *Ibid.*

29. *Ibid.*

30. *Ibid*; *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 36, 124; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 571.

31. *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 22, 36, 55, 87, 124; for Courtenay and Arundel, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 21, 160; J.A.F. Thomson, 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', p. 235; *Wedgwood, passim*.

Described as 'our trusty and well-beloved' knight by the Queen in 1481, Oxfordshire's William Stonor sat for the county in 1478 and was admitted to the bench in the same month; knighted and a knight of the body soon after, by 1481 he was viewed by a client as 'the greatest man with my lord [Dorset]'.³² His neighbours, knights William Norris (whose wife was the Queen's lady-in-waiting) and Thomas Delamare, moved in the same circles.³³ Clearly admission to the Woodville circle meant ties with other major powers within their orbit such as John, Lord Strange (d. 1479, whose title Sir George Stanley inherited) from whom Stonor sought a retainer in 1478, which Strange was reluctant to grant because 'I will not be overmastered with none of my fee'd men',³⁴ and with major powers such as Lord Stanley, his brother Sir William, and his son, George. It is possible that both Stonor and Norris were clients of Lord Stanley; Norris had served with Sir William in the Midlands in 1471; Stonor if not fee'd by John, Lord Strange in 1478 was probably retained by Stanley's son; certainly both he and Norris were closely connected with Stanley as the earl of Derby in 1489.³⁵

It was, in fact, Edward's men in the Home Counties whom the Woodvilles had most actively cultivated by 1478. Woodville proteges in the parliament of 1478 included Sir Thomas Vaughan (Cornwall), John Fogge junior (Launceston), Sir John Fogge (Kent), Richard Haute (Canterbury), John Wood (Surrey), Nicholas Gaynesford (Southwark) and John Fiennes (Sussex). The Gaynesfords were also patronised by the Staffords having represented the Stafford seat of Bletchingly a number of times. Yet their Woodville connections obtained for them the seat of Guildford (1473-5) in the Queen's gift, and helped them to the shrievalty four times between 1474-1482.³⁶ Woodville success here reflects both their influence with the King and the absence of active 'political' magnates in the region vying for rewards to attract clients. The gentry here were themselves the King's retainers and major powers within the region. It is not surprising that the Woodvilles, promoted by the King, should patronise the household in the form of regional offices to solid country gentry. The strength of these ties is also reflected in the gentry's household positions and the 'much patronised' Nicholas Gaynesford transferred his services to the Queen's chamber in 1476, joining his wife, Margaret Sidney, and the wives of Vaughan, Richard Haute, Fogge, Sir William Norris, William Uvedale, Richard Gaynesford and probably Stonor's mother, Jane, who enjoyed the Queen's confidence.³⁷ Others who served

32. *Stonor Letters* Vol. 1, p. xxxii and Vol.2, no. 285.

33. C.C.R., 1476-85., no. 826, and *Wedgwood*, p. 573 for Delamare.

34. *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 2, no. 230

35. B.L. Cotton Ms, Julius B. XII f. 55.

36. V.C.H., Surrey, Vol. 4, p. 275; Sir William Haute was sheriff in 1474 and 1482; Richard Haute esquire in 1477 and 1481.

37. For Jane Stonor see *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, p. xxxii.

Elizabeth Woodville included her carvers, Sir Humphrey Bourghier and Jacques Haute, (Richard's brother) and Thomas Fiennes.

Nor was Woodville interest in these men confined to local offices. Fogge, Scott, Vaughan and Haute (as noted) were appointed to the Prince's council at Ludlow, and while there is no evidence that either Fogge or Scott was involved in council matters, both men along with Vaughan and Haute had been selected as his tutors in 1473. Other doors opened for the gentry as members of the Prince's council. Haute in particular was well-served by Rivers, and after the surrender to the Prince of the earldom of Pembroke, he held numerous offices in west Wales becoming steward, butler and constable of the castle of Haverfordwest, and steward, butler and armourer of the castle of Pembroke and more.³⁸ With Vaughan and Sir Richard Croft he also held commissions of the peace in the border counties through Rivers's influence, along with Lord Dacre.³⁹ Woodville patronage also enabled Fogge (with Rivers and later Dorset) to administer the Prince's duchy of Cornwall lands in the South West from 1473, and to dispense his own patronage. In the parliament of 1478, for example, John Fineux, a lawyer from Canterbury and a justice in Kent, John Bamme, a Kentish commissioner from Dartford and Henry Frowick - all Fogge associates - were returned for Cornwall, while (as noted) Fogge's son John was returned in the same year for Launceston.⁴⁰

At Edward's death in April 1483, Woodville influence had permeated every region in the South, stretching north as far as the palatinate of Chester, and across the country to East Anglia. With an enormous network of clients, those who had court connections had Woodville connections; and many who had Woodville connections came to possess court connections. Through a process beginning around the mid-1470s power at the top and in the regions had changed hands. By 1483 Dorset was now supreme in the South West, having consolidated his position after Clarence's death, and had obtained the wardship and marriage of the earl of Warwick together with the custody of nine manors. His power was greatly enhanced in 1483 (the year in which he obtained the Ferrers and Astley estates) when a match was arranged between Dorset's young son and the daughter of the late duchess of Exeter from her second marriage.⁴¹ Dorset's younger brother, Richard also benefited in 1483 gaining a substantial block

38. Lowe, 'The Council of the Prince of Wales', p. 289.

39. C.P.R., 1467-77, pp. 614-6, 627-8, 635-6; C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 560-1, 570-1, 578; Lowe, 'The Council of the Prince of Wales', p. 290.

40. C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 339; Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 418; Houghton, *op.cit.*, p. 137.

41. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 73-4.

of estates in the West.⁴² In East Anglia the duke of Norfolk's death in 1476 and the political inactivity of Suffolk, consolidated the position of John, Lord Howard and others. Yet here too the Woodvilles dominated, and the most powerful magnate in Norfolk at this time was Earl Rivers; in possession of the Scales estates, he was steward of the duchy of Lancaster, of the Queen's dower lands, and had also become steward and constable of Castle Rising.⁴³ By 1483 East Anglian figures such as lawyer, Thomas Lovell, John Wingfield, the Brewes, Brandons and more knew the patronage of Rivers and Dorset and were active in local life, and at court.⁴⁴ From 1480 the latter had been active in Norfolk appearing on commissions with local powers such as Robert Brandon, while the influence of Rivers was such that in January, 1483, he was in Norfolk attempting to place his own men as members for Yarmouth. In this he had only partial success, as his deputy, John Rushe, the Pastons' client and associate of Stonor, Stanley and Buckingham, was returned.⁴⁵

By 1483, Woodville influence throughout the South is most evident in the appointments to the subsidy commission of April 27, just days after Edward's death. Appointed with Dorset in the West were Devon knights Robert Willoughby, John Crocker and John Halwell; in Dorset Sir Thomas St Leger, Sir Nicholas Latimer, esquires William Berkeley and William Uvedale; in Cornwall, Edward Courtenay and Richard Nanfan; in Wiltshire, Sir Roger Tocotes, esquires John Cheyney, William Collingbourne and Walter Hungerford; in Somerset, Sir William Paulet, Sir Giles Daubenay, John Biconell; in Oxfordshire-Berkshire, Sir William Stonor and Sir William Norris; in Kent with Earl Rivers, knights John Fogge and John Scott, and Roger Brent; and in Sussex with the earl of Arundel, Thomas and Richard Lewkenor.⁴⁶ No doubt the Woodvilles also 'assisted' household appointments, and some within their circle certainly profited in the early 1480s: Giles Daubenay was an esquire of the body in 1477 and soon after a knight of the bath, then knight of the body to Edward by 1480; Stonor, was also a knight of the body by 1478; in addition, Walter Hungerford, William Uvedale, John Norris, James Haute and

42. C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 139, 174, 212, 263, 283-4; *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, pp. 215-8; Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, pp. 73-4.

43. Virgoe, 'An Election Dispute of 1483', pp. 31-2.

44. Ives, 'Andrew Dymmock and the Papers of Antony, Earl Rivers, 1482-3', pp. 220-1. Lovell was a J.P. in Norfolk and of the quorum from 1478: *Wedgwood*, p. 555; Somerville, *op.cit.*, p. 455; Wingfield was sheriff in 1482.

45. For Dorset, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 215; for Rivers-Rushe, Ives, 'Andrew Dymmock and the Papers of Antony, Earl Rivers, 1482-3', p. 222 and n.5.

46. C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 353.

Thomas Fiennes - all with close connections in the Queen's household - along with Thomas Audley and Robert Poyntz became esquires of the body between 1480 and 1482.⁴⁷

Historians, generally, have given the Woodvilles a bad press. Described as an 'upstart magnate' family, 'not conspicuous for charm and amiability', they have been reproved for their exploitative tactics, ambition and greed. Their council at Ludlow and offices in the Marches created a 'victim' rather than a 'beneficiary' of Lord Herbert in the early 1470s, while through their actions Buckingham remained in 'political limbo'. They jealously guarded the Prince's patronage freezing out others - established lords in the area such as Grey of Ruthin, Maltravers and Lord Strange. Others suffered at their expense through the resettlement of both the Mowbray and Holland inheritances. Not content with their power, in 1478 they 'directed' a movement with 'all the king's relatives and servants...to destroy their common enemy, Clarence'.⁴⁸

Despite their tactics, however, by 1483 there was a unity at court and a stability in the regions which had developed in the twelve years since Tewkesbury, and for which the Woodvilles along with other powerful magnates, must take some credit. There appeared to be no deep rifts in political society after 1471, although Oxford's revolt in 1473, Clarence's attainder and death in 1478, and the rivalry between Hastings and Dorset from 1471 until Edward's death, were discordant notes.⁴⁹ By the early 1480s, however, gentry from powerful military families (from the West and East, and some formerly in opposition) such as St Leger, Edward Courtenay, Thomas Arundel, John St Lo, John Cheyney, William Norris and Robert Willoughby, legal careersists like Biconell, Hody and the Gaynesfords, administrators such as Richard Harcourt, William Berkeley, William Uvedale, Anthony Brown and Richard Lewkenor, with courtiers including George Brown, William Stonor, John Fogge the Guildfords and more had worked together for years, either at home or away in any number of permutations; and with major powers like Stanley, Howard, Arundel, Hastings, and Strange,

⁴⁷. Generally, see above, Part 2, Chapter 4; for Daubenay, *Memorials*, no. 189; for Audley, Poyntz and Haute, *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 261, 299, 323; *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 867.

⁴⁸. Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 97, 99; Morgan, 'The House of Policy', p. 65; Hicks, 'The Changing Role of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', pp. 80-1; see also Pugh, *op.cit.*, pp. 92-3.

⁴⁹. See Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 123 for the animosity between Hastings and the Woodvilles. Hastings had replaced Earl Rivers as lieutenant of Calais in 1471; see also Mancini, p. 68 and More, *op.cit.*, pp. 10-11.

and from the late 1470s almost always with one of the Woodvilles: Dorset and his brother Richard, Rivers and his brothers Edward, and Lionel, bishop of Salisbury.⁵⁰

The flexibility of public life after Tewkesbury (as demonstrated) was not new. Following periods of conflict and guided by the crown's own policy, political differences did not hamper royal service. Certainly by 1483 the introduction into the regions of a number of younger faces directing gentry activity - Daubenay, Courtenay, Arundel, Cheyney, Uvedale, Stonor, Fogge junior, Richard Guildford and others, injected new life into the localities. Flexibility too, had encouraged less a sense of sharply defined counties, as regions in the South, whose borders were fluid and whose concerns were entwined - as evidenced by the activity of the aristocracy. Again, the range of activity was not new; the fathers and grandfathers of the above had behaved in much the same way, travelling the South, their contacts reflecting their regional power and court patronage. Undeniably, however, there was a sense of purpose and a cohesion among the gentry in 1483. To a large degree stability was engendered by Edward's policies in the regions and his reorganisation of the power centres in the South; in turn, stability in the regions was reinforced at the centre, involving a hierarchy of household servants in a wide range of activity. Leading household men as well as their subordinates were enveloped in the structure which provided a duality of service, both at court and in the country.⁵¹

Changes in the royal household are noticeable from 1469 when Edward began to increase the power of the gentry in the regions. Morgan emphasises a lack of political unity in the household at this time, when, in the face of revolt, it was 'neither sufficiently inclusive nor sufficiently cohesive to act as a controlling force'.⁵² This began to change in October 1469 when Edward, released from captivity, began to form the household into a cohesive unit bestowing on his servants important commissions and offices. Seen also as arbiter of the disputes of his men the King began to tighten the bonds between himself and his household. On his return from exile he continued this process which 'drew the group together' and at Barnet and Tewkesbury 'King Edward won a wider mastery'.⁵³ The King's affinity was further strengthened from the early 1470s by his new regionalism, designed both to finance the household and broaden the Yorkist base, and in so doing, elicit the 'goodwill and obedience' of the magnates without making inordinate concessions to a powerful class.⁵⁴

50. C.C.R., 1476-85, nos. 719, 748, 749, 1258, 1370.

51. Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', pp. 19-21.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

54. Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 331.

The South benefited from the period of calm, due as much to the subsidence of magnate rivalries as to the influence of powerful patrons like the Woodvilles. But this in itself is a tribute to Edward's kingship and to his policies in the regions. It highlights the King's political skills and vindicates the free rein given his lieutenants in the regions. Foremost among these were the Woodvilles who actively cultivated the gentry through the 1470s so that by the early 1480s most leading knights and esquires in the South were Woodville associates - borne out by their household positions, appointments to the shrievalty and the bench, their offices in duchy administration and within the Prince of Wales's council. In fact while the discussion has demonstrated the numerous patrons who courted the gentry, few of their connections by 1483 were as blatantly political as those with the Woodvilles. Yet above all the gentry served the crown. With vast wealth and power, a number of knights were themselves royal lieutenants and power-brokers in the regions. In the absence of divisive magnate rivalries, by 1483, the gentry had consolidated their power.

While, by this time, power had changed at the top, patterns of gentry patronage had not altered markedly. And following periods of conflict which saw the death of Warwick, Henry VI and his son in 1471 (as with Suffolk's death in 1450 or that of Devon and York ten years on) there were no power vacuums or long-term rifts within society. The same applies in a different context in the 1470s after Norfolk's death in 1476 or Clarence's removal in 1478. The gentry were too powerful and too well-patronised to be leaderless, and with the political eclipse or death of nobles, other figures moved into the spotlight, among them leading knights and esquires themselves. This was the case in 1483 when after the Edward's death and the fall of the Woodvilles, the gentry became the recipients of (among others) Buckingham's patronage and of Richard himself - some, receiving their best rewards at this time.

It would be foolish to argue that the periods of conflict from 1459 were simply brief interludes in an otherwise tranquil society. The lists of proscribed undermine this thesis. Yet undoubtedly the flexibility of society at the local level encouraged stability, and, for this the gentry (along with the King and the nobility) must take much of the credit. Gentry leadership in the regions was rewarded at court, where increasingly it was they who by 1483 'wait[ed] most upon the king'.⁵⁵ It was also the gentry who, just months later, acted in concert to bring down the government. While the machinations of the Woodvilles, Buckingham and Richard will shortly be discussed, it is noteworthy and rather ironic that the stability achieved after Tewkesbury enabled the gentry to coalesce: courtiers and administrators, active knights and esquires, solid country gentry - all reacted to the events after Edward's death. Never before had such a large group of powerful and politically active men made such an unequivocal

⁵⁵. Morgan, 'The House of Policy', p. 58.

statement against the crown. This in itself is the biggest tribute to Edward's kingship, and to his policies both at court and in the country.

PART 4

RICHARD'S RUIN

CHAPTER 10

CONTINUITY: COURT AND COUNTY, APRIL - OCTOBER, 1483

The following chapter is divided into two sections. The first will explore the careers of Edward IV's household gentry between April and October 1483, highlighting their promotion in, or exclusion from, both court and county administration. Did the new King make a serious attempt to cultivate the household, and who among the gentry benefited most in the months before the rising? Section two will focus on the calibre of the rebels, stressing both their experience and range of service to the crown. Were these men easy to replace and what did their revolt mean for Richard at court and at the local level?

The new King's coronation on 6 July, 1483, was attended by most of the nobility and more than one hundred knights, almost half of whom had been Edward IV's household men.¹ A solid proportion of these had been intimates of the former King as his knights and esquires of the body, and as such had officiated at his funeral on 16 April; among them George Brown (who carried the funeral banner), Nicholas Gaynesford, William Berkeley, John Cheyney, Walter Hungerford (who helped bear Edward's corpse), Thomas Bourghier, Giles Daubenay, William Norris, Thomas St Leger and Robert Poyntz, who watched over the dead King at Windsor.² Just over seven weeks later on 5 June, fifty of the dead King's servants were summoned for knighthood at Edward V's coronation (postponed until 22 June) including Edward Courtenay, Thomas Arundel, John Wingfield, Christopher Willoughby, Thomas Lewkenor, William Berkeley (of Beverstone), John Paulet, William Cheyney (of Shepey), William Uvedale and Thomas Hampden.³ Little more than four weeks later, following Richard's usurpation, St Leger, John Cheyney and Sir William Stonor, among others, were prominent at the new King's coronation.⁴ There was little to suggest - outwardly at least - the approaching tide of

1. One hundred and four knights representing ninety six families attended the King's coronation; see B.L., Add Ms 6113, f. 19.

2. *Archaeologia*, I, p. 348.

3. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 11, see also n. 9; *Extant Documents*, pp. 19-20. Seven of these men were retainers of Lord Hastings, see W. H. Dunham, 'Lord Hastings' Indentured Retainers 1461-1483: The lawfulness of Livery and Retaining under the Yorkists and Tudors', *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. XXXIX (1955), pp. 123-6.

4. St Leger and Cheyney received gifts of cloth for the event: B.L., Add Ms 6113, f. 19b; for St Leger, *Extant Documents*, pp. 272, 390-1; for Cheyney, selected by the barons of the Cinque Ports for the honour, *ibid.*, p. 199; Stonor carried the carpet during the coronation ceremony: *Wedgwood*, p. 815.

disaffection. Yet significantly within fifteen weeks over one-third of the southern gentry present at the coronation were in rebellion.⁵

Given these figures it may be instructive to analyse Richard's policy towards Edward IV's servants in the South in the weeks before Edward V's proposed coronation, and in the months following his own. Thus far the discussion has highlighted the new King's nervousness in the counties and at court, reflected in the omissions from the bench not just in the South, but further afield, both after Edward's death and his own accession. Was the King's attitude to Edward's household one of appeasement and his policy one of continuity, or is it possible to detect slight changes or shifts in emphases in central administration which may have unnerved the gentry, creating a climate in which sedition flourished? While the evidence is sketchy, it is planned - where possible - to survey new appointments and confirmations in office of the rebels, in central and household administration.

The names of the gentry selected for honours at Edward V's coronation, including seven from the South West, three from the South East, one from the Central South and three from East Anglia, are extant in a list of knights present at Richard's coronation.⁶ As wealthy and powerful royal servants from old knightly families, the honour accorded them was not incommensurate with their standing. Those nominated for knighthood in early June, who in fact received them at Richard's coronation include Thomas Arundel, William Berkeley and Thomas Lewkenor. Other knights at the coronation include Thomas St Leger, Giles Daubenay, Nicholas Latimer, John St Lo, Thomas Delamare, William Norris, William Stonor, William Knyvett, George Brown, John Guildford, William Brandon, Richard Beauchamp (Lord St Amand, although never summoned as such) and Thomas Bourghier.⁷ In addition, another eleven

5. This figure includes 30/55 'sample' gentry selected for the survey. Throughout the discussion the focus will be on these men: fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen identified in Part 2, Chapter 4, unless otherwise stated. All have been identified as Edward's former household servants, or, as having had close connections with the household through immediate kin; many were attainted as rebel leaders. For knights, B.L., Add Ms 6113, fos 19-19b; for esquires of the body, *Memorials* and *Extant Documents*, *passim*.

6. B.L. Add Ms 6113.

7. For Arundel, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 2; for Berkeley, B.L., Add Ms 6113, f. 19b and *Extant Documents*, p. 274, and for Lewkenor, *ibid.*, pp. 274, 367. Lewkenor's uncle, Richard, was also made a knight of the bath. For other sample rebels, John Wingfield was appointed to receive a knighthood at Edward V's coronation, and was knighted by Richard in December, 1483: Wingfield ed. *op.cit.*, p. 28; Courtenay, was knighted by Henry Tudor, fifteen days before Bosworth; William Cheyney

knights were close kinsmen of the rebels: Henry Wingfield, John Wood, Nicholas (or William) St Lo, Philip Berkeley, Richard Harcourt, Philip Courtenay, Roger Fiennes, Richard Darrell, John Lewkenor, Christopher Willoughby and John Brown.⁸ While there is no such list of attendant esquires it may be assumed that most of Edward's esquires of the body and other key household figures attended the coronation in an official capacity, such as John Cheyney and his brother, William, Edward Courtenay, Robert Poyntz, John Wingfield, John Norris, Walter Hungerford, Richard Guildford, Richard Gaynesford and Robert and William Brandon. The knights omitted from the list are the West Country powers, Robert Willoughby, John Crocker, Thomas Fulford, William Overey and Roger Tocotes ; and from the South East William Haute and John Fogge.

The omission of the last two is no surprise. Fogge had been in sanctuary at Westminster with the Woodvilles after their downfall, and although allegedly reconciled with the King on the first day of his reign, he was either not invited or absented himself from the coronation.⁹ Likewise Sir William Haute, replaced as sheriff of Kent by Sir Henry Ferrers, was either excluded or refused the invitation.¹⁰ His brother, Sir Richard, had been controller of the Prince of Wales's household and had been recently executed with Rivers, Grey and Sir Thomas Vaughan (the Prince's chamberlain) at Pontefract on 26 June. Yet few apart from those most closely connected with the Prince's household at Ludlow, were ostracised in early May. Sir William Haute's kinsman, Edmund, lost an annuity to Walter Hungerford, while Robert Poyntz, Earl Rivers's son-in-law, whose family had long been associated with the Woodvilles, was replaced as sheriff of Southampton on 15 May by kinsman William Berkeley; he was also relieved of the constableness of Carisbrooke Castle which he had held with the Queen's brother, Sir Edward Woodville, and the castle of St Briavel's, Gloucester, held with Rivers.¹¹

There was certainly no witchhunt on Richard's part, however, among Edward's household gentry. Membership of the Woodville circle at Ludlow or Westminster did not necessarily mean ostracism. Many of those who had served the young Prince made the transition to Westminster,

was not knighted either by Richard III or Henry VII, while Uvedale was honoured in November, 1489.

8. B.L., Add Ms 6113, f. 19-19b.

9. More, *op.cit.*, p. 84; *Memorials*, no. 141.

10. Ferrers was a former servant of Edward IV and nephew of Lord Hastings: Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 101.

11. *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*; B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 76; B.L.H.M., Vol. 3, p. 1. R. Horrox makes the point that in replacing Poyntz with his kinsman, Berkeley, Richard perhaps hoped to stave off criticism from that powerful circle: Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 100-1.

and further royal service. Sir John Scott, for example, tutor to the Prince with Fogge and others, continued his employment under Richard and attended his coronation.¹² So too, Sir Richard Croft, much of whose patronage derived from the Woodvilles in and around Ludlow and the Marches, was also patronised by Gloucester, later becoming a knight of the body to Richard. Similarly, John Sulyard, a legal careerist of Suffolk and also tutor to the Prince, (1473-83) became a justice of the king's bench in 1484.¹³ While a few like Poyntz were unlucky, many more like Sir William Knyvet, a Woodville associate and councillor to Buckingham, were promoted. Further, in penalising some of Edward V's servants, Richard promoted others including Edward IV's esquires of the body, John Norris and Walter Hungerford who were placed in the young King's household.¹⁴

Generally, continuity was also a feature in central administration during Gloucester's protectorate. Thomas Rotherham, close to the Queen, was replaced as chancellor on 10 May by John Russell, bishop of Lincoln. Yet Oliver King, the former King's secretary, remained in his post as did Robert Morton as master of the rolls, although Sir Thomas Vaughan, treasurer of the chamber under Edward was not replaced.¹⁵ With minimal disruption, some were promoted at this time like Thomas Lovell, an associate of Dorset, who became 'spigurnelle' in the chancery.¹⁶

Again, while the evidence is patchy, generally Richard appears to have left the household at Westminster largely unaltered, and even those changes necessitated by his strike against the Woodvilles saw former servants of Edward IV placed around Edward V, like Norris and Hungerford, rather than his own associates.¹⁷ Among those who continued under Edward V were John Cheyney (albeit briefly) as master of the henchmen and master of the horse, paid £40 by order of Edward's executors; his associates, Peter Curtis, keeper of the wardrobe, and under him George Lovekyn, serjeant-tailor, Roger Haute and William Melbourne; William Daubenay, Richard Lawrence and Roland Forster, clerk and yeomen of the jewelhouse, respectively, and Robert Appleby, yeoman of the wardrobe. One of the few changes

12. *Memorials*, no. 145.

13. *Wedgwood*, pp. 827-8.

14. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 21-2, 48; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, pp. 8-9; *Archaeologia* I, pp. 350-3.

15. For Oliver King, Otway-Ruthven, *op.cit.*, pp. 66-7; for Morton, Waters, 'The Gloucester Scene - August 1483', p. 240; for Vaughan, *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 157; *Vergil*, p. 540.

16. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 107.

17. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 105.

was a result of natural causes and saw the replacement of the deceased earl of Essex as treasurer of the household, by his deputy, Sir John Wood.¹⁸

In the duchy of Cornwall administration, however, the Woodvilles' departure left spaces to be filled and again Gloucester turned to his brother's men rather than his own. John Sapcote, former esquire of the body to Edward replaced Rivers as receiver of the duchy; his brother-in-law, John, Lord Dinham, one of Edward's lieutenants in the South West with much experience in duchy affairs, received the stewardship;¹⁹ while Avery Cornburgh, steward of the duchy and occupier of the stanneries in Devon and Cornwall under Edward, obtained Vaughan's position as controller of the coinage of tin. Others gained lesser offices such as William Cheyney, bailiff of the stannaries of Penwith and Kerye, Cornwall.²⁰

In other areas too, Richard turned to Edward IV's servants. On 10 May Gloucester commissioned Sir Thomas Fulford and John Halwell to move against Sir Edward Woodville, lying with his fleet in Southampton Water, and who was in possession of the Crown Jewels. Further to this, on 14 May he directed William Berkeley, William Uvedale and Roger Kelsale to victual a fleet under John Welles, Thomas Grey and Edward Brampton, all former servants of Edward IV.²¹ The Woodville forfeitures available from 15 May, enabled Gloucester to reward these men. On 11 May Berkeley and Uvedale had received the castles of Carisbrooke and Porchester formerly held by Sir Edward Woodville and Robert Poyntz. William Clifford was confirmed in the receivership of Middleton and Marden in Kent (formerly Clarence's lands obtained by the Woodvilles) and granted twenty marks yearly, while by 28 May Sir William Knyvet had received the stewardship and constableness of Castle Rising, becoming as well ranger of the chase, forfeited by Earl Rivers.²² Robert Brandon also profited, gaining the stewardships of Tilney, Islington and Barton in Norfolk. Some such as Sir Walter Hungerford benefited through their colleagues' misfortune, acquiring Edmund Haute's annuity of twenty

18. For Cheyney, *Extant Documents*, pp. 137, 321; for Curtis, *Extant Documents*, p. 139 and P.R.O., E 404/78/2/27; for Lovekyn, A.F. Sutton, 'George Lovekyn, Tailor to Three Kings of England, 1470-1504', *Costume* (1981), p. 4, and *Extant Documents*, p. 136; for Haute and Melbourne, *Extant Documents*, pp. 103, 137; for Daubenay, Lawrence and Forster, P.R.O. E 404/77/3/36; for Appleby, P.R.O., E 404/78/3/9; for Essex-Wood, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 15.

19. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 18, 20; *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, no. 264; *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, pp. 173, 176; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 218, 228; Pearse Chope, 'The Last of the Dynhams', pp. 437-58; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 104 and n. 39.

20. For Cornburgh, Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 104-5; for William Cheyney, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 124.

21. *B.L.H.M.*, introd., pp. xxiii-xxiv and Vol. 3, p. 1.

22. *Grants, Edward V*, pp. 59-60; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 59, 71.

marks from the Woodville lordship of Merton. In the main, however, there is little to suggest that gentry who had served the Prince of Wales or Elizabeth Woodville - apart from Fogge, Poyntz and the Hautes - were victimised²³

From the limited patronage available Richard made a point of cultivating Edward's household with grants and confirmations. In addition to his rewards William Berkeley obtained custody of the Isle of Wight and an annuity of ten pounds and Walter Hungerford, the keepership of West Park in Corsham, Wiltshire.²⁴ Robert Morton was confirmed as steward of his uncle (John Morton, bishop of Ely) in Ely and Huntingdon and bailiff of the Isle of Ely, on 10 May. Also in East Anglia Thomas Lovell was confirmed in the lordship and manor of Polstede Hall, Burnham, in Norfolk, while Robert Brewes won an annuity of ten pounds for the term of his life from Suffolk.²⁵ On 20 May Robert Brandon became controller of the great and petty customs in Plymouth and Fowey; John Norris received the wardship and marriage of the daughter and heiress of Henry Waver esquire; and Sir Richard Harcourt obtained the same of the young Richard Fiennes, Lord Say and Sele.²⁶

As the pattern of patronage suggests, gentry from the South West and East Anglia were most favoured: Walter Hungerford, William Berkeley, William Uvedale, Roger Kelsale, Knyvet, the Brandons, John Norris and Thomas Lovell - quite possibly through their connections with the duke of Buckingham. Yet following Edward's death these men and more were promoted in local administration. Norris, for example, obtained a peace commission in Berkshire; John Donne in Buckinghamshire (May); Thomas Cheyney in Cambridgeshire (June); knights Philip Courtenay, John Crocker and Thomas Fulford in Devon (May and June respectively); Nicholas Latimer and William Twynyho in Dorset (June); John Guildford in Kent (June); Sir Christopher Willoughby in Suffolk (June); and Nicholas Gaynesford and Ralph Tykull in Surrey (June).

Richard's policies in this respect are hardly surprising. Continuity of government between reigns was a standard practice; and given the particular circumstances of Gloucester's takeover and the stature of these men, not only was it in the Protector's interests to utilise the talents of the leading gentry - it was essential. Not only did he rely on the expertise of the household

23. For Brandon and Hungerford, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 48, 51.

24. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 76, 87, 191.

25. For Morton, C. S. L. Davies, "Bishop John Morton, the Holy See, and the accession of Henry VII", p.3, n. 4; for Lovell and Brewes, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 122, 146.

26. For Brandon, *Wedgwood*, p. 103; for Norris, *Grants, Edward V*, p. 64; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 9; for Harcourt, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 86.

servants in the South to direct local government, but they provided a vital line of communication from the counties to court, linking local officials with the royal household. Importantly, they provided the crown with intelligence from the regions without which the ruler would remain ignorant of local affairs and prospective servants.²⁷ Richard's success or failure depended on these men and this channel of communication. Many of Edward IV's household servants had not been simply local leaders, they were regional power-brokers whose power and influence spanned whole regions, providing them with a status which, at times rivalled the lesser nobility.

This notwithstanding, some prominent local leaders lost patronage gained under Edward, a fall from grace which is reflected in their omissions from the bench in May and June, and which seems to testify to Richard's nervousness with some of the most powerful of his brother's men. Omitted were Gloucester's brother-in-law, Sir Thomas St Leger in Southampton and Surrey and John Cheyney in Wiltshire and Dorset. Others affected were Cheyney's brother, Alexander, in Berkshire, Richard Morton in Dorset, Sir William Brandon and his son, William in Essex, Sir William Haute in Kent, John Trevelyan in Somerset, Sir Thomas Brewes and John Wingfield in Suffolk, George Brown in Surrey and Thomas Lewkenor in Sussex.

Some exclusions were due no doubt to age and infirmity or competing interests rather than political eclipse. St Leger, for example, was dropped in Southampton and Surrey, but remained on all Devonshire commissions until after 28 August. Others were possibly overlooked in the uncertainty following Edward's death. Yet again some omissions - John Cheyney in Dorset and Wiltshire, his brother in Berkshire, the Brandons in Essex, Brewes and Wingfield in Suffolk, Brown and perhaps Lewkenor - were more significant. And while Cheyney, Brown and others, initially at least, remained in the household receiving grants and later gifts from Richard for the coronation, the implication is that while Gloucester favoured them at court and under his wing, he also moved to curtail their influence in the regions. From Dorset, Paulet, summoned for a knighthood on 5 June, yet later overlooked, may also fit into this category. In addition, the exclusion of powerful East Anglian knights and esquires, former associates of Earl Rivers, may be ascribed to this connection, or to friction with the new powers, Buckingham and John, Lord Howard, newly created duke of Norfolk or to a greater power with new concerns - Richard himself.

27. See Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 181. See also above, Part 2, Chapter 3, for the intimacy of relationships between Edward IV and his leading household and regional servants. Rather than local servants, Edward's gentry leaders had regional status; this point will be developed later in the text.

While Richard sought to curb the power of some regional leaders in May and June by their removal from the bench yet retention at court, Sir John Fogge is an important exception. After Edward's death Sir John had lost the keepership of the writs of the common bench, and his office as king's councillor. Having removed Fogge's influence at court, Richard retained him as a peace commissioner probably in an attempt to win over the local Kentish gentry, of whom Fogge, with his local power and regional stature was an undisputed leader. Clearly, Richard's treatment of Fogge highlights his dilemma. Unhappy with the great influence wielded by Fogge, yet he was forced to compromise. More surprising still is the inclusion of Lionel Woodville, bishop of Salisbury, on the Wiltshire bench in July, which (unless an error) implies that Richard wanted to be seen as conciliatory and not hellbent on reprisals. Fogge notwithstanding, if Richard were unsure of some regional powers after his strike against the Woodvilles, he continued to promote their interests at court. This was also the case in the weeks following his accession and the few changes that did occur in court and county administration reflect the King's desperate need to cultivate the regional leaders as much as his confidence in his brother's power-base in the South.²⁸

It is impossible to gauge accurately Edward IV's knights and esquires of the body who remained in the household under Richard. R. Horrox has estimated that fifteen of the dead king's knights of the body (in number between thirty and forty) were members of the new King's household, while another was a councillor and eight others obtained gifts 'commensurate with household status'. Seven knights of the body rebelled; with the exception of Woodville, St Leger and Brown, Richard retained them as royal servants in the localities, which indicates, most likely, their continued household status.²⁹ Of the esquires of the body the number retained by Richard is even more difficult to assess. Yet there is no reason to suppose, apart from those mentioned, that either the King or the knights or esquires balked at household service. Further down the scale, the names of eight of Edward's yeomen of the crown who entered Richard's service are known due to their subsequent revolt: William Knight, Richard Cruse, William Frost, Richard Potter, Richard Fisher, John Boutayne, Roger Kelsale (also usher of the chamber) and William Strode;³⁰ while John Smyth of Dorset, yeoman of the chamber under Edward, was confirmed in office in May, 1483.³¹

²⁸. R. Horrox contends that the few changes to the peace commissions reflected Richard's 'belief that he had inherited his brother's power-base in the counties': Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 139-41.

²⁹. *Ibid.*, p. 146 and see below for St Leger. The knights of the body employed by Richard are William Stonor, William Norris, Giles Daubenay and Thomas Bourghier.

³⁰. *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, pp. 245-6; *Wedgwood* provides a picture of those who remained in the household; see also Horrox, *Richard III*, especially pp. 105, 191. Strode is of some interest as a

The casualties at court after the coronation throw some light on the motives behind the bench omissions in May and June, with John Cheyney for one (already off the bench) losing his household positions to Sir James Tyrell in late June. The most prominent knight snubbed at court in early July was St Leger (as noted a knight of the body) dismissed from the household as controller of the mint and master of the hart hounds. Yet almost as a softener, both St Leger and Cheyney played a part in Richard's coronation and were favoured with gifts; St Leger honoured with velvet to wear in the Vigil procession.³² Others who lost central posts after Richard's accession include Peter Curtis who forfeited the custody of the king's privy palace and the king's beds and clothes at Westminster to Robert Appleby; Robert Morton who was relieved of his mastership of the rolls on 22 September; and six days later, George Lovekyn, the king's tailor (whose brother-in-law William Payne was John Cheyney's servant) who lost his serjeanty of the great wardrobe to Henry Davy at the end of the month.³³ Other posts had been vacated around the end of July with the alleged plot and execution of John Smith, a groom of the stirrup under Edward, (again whose superior had been John Cheyney, master of the king's horse) and Stephen Ireland a wardrober in the Tower; Robert Rushe, serjeant of London and most probably a kinsman of merchant John Rushe (client of Earl Rivers, Buckingham and the Norfolk Pastons, and associate of Lord Stanley, Margaret Beaufort and Sir William Stonor) and William Davy, pardoner of Hounslow.³⁴ In the counties others lost estate positions such as Robert Poyntz (who had already relinquished offices in May) now relieved of the stewardship of Sodbury, Gloucestershire to Nicholas Spicer, John Welles, half-brother to Margaret Beaufort, who also forfeited his estates and Robert Radcliffe who forfeited offices at Sheen to Davy, above-mentioned.³⁵

Conversely, others received their richest rewards at this time, and it is clear that the new King was making a concerted effort to win over the majority of regional leaders, evident in the knighthoods bestowed on Arundel, Berkeley and others, and later in terms of gifts, confirmations and offices on royal estates. Again the same names appear: Hungerford was

servant both of Buckingham and formerly of Lord Hastings: P.R.O., C67/51/30; see also Appendix 4, p. 32.

31. C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 32, 382; P.R.O., E 404/78/1/3; P.R.O., C67/51/25.

32. *Wedgwood*, p. 892; *Extant Documents*, p. 390-1.

33. C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 30, 320, 408, 483, 513. Curtis later regained his position, yet by mid-May 1485 lost both his lands and office and went into sanctuary at Westminster, see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 283.

34. *Annales*, p. 460; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 149; see also above, Part 1, Chapter 1.

35. For Poyntz, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 76; C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 99; for Welles whose intrigue will shortly be discussed, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 7; for Ratcliffe, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 78, 89, 90.

confirmed in the keepership of Corsham, Wiltshire, and received further grants, while Uvedale was retained in his offices in Porchester and Portsmouth, for 'as long as the King pleases' ; Thomas Audley retained the constableness of Corfe Castle, John Halwell kept offices awarded under Edward and Thomas Arundel acquired the wardship and marriage of William Pole in September. In the South East Richard Guildford obtained the wardship and marriage of John Langley and Sir Thomas Bourgchier received custody of Leeds Castle, Kent.³⁶ Similarly the Delamares were favoured at this time, along with Sir Richard Harcourt, confirmed in the stewardship of Broughton and Bloxham in September, 1483, and Thomas Croft, who (despite losing his Oxfordshire peace commission) retained his offices under Edward, becoming, in addition, deputy butler at Bristol, Exeter and Dartmouth in August.³⁷

Significantly few changes with regard to the future rebels occurred in local administration, with a number of additions to, rather than exclusions from the bench after Richard's accession. In the West, for example, Thomas Arundel and Edward Courtenay were selected for commissions in Cornwall (July); John Halwell in Devon (August); Richard Beauchamp in Gloucestershire (July) and Sir Giles Daubenay and William Hody in Somerset (26 July).³⁸ Those included on the August subsidy commissions in the South, however, provide the best clues as to the servants most favoured and pre-eminent in the regions at this stage. Perhaps Buckingham had sponsored some. However these families had been active for generations in both household and local administration; in the South West, knights Thomas St Leger, (despite losing other patronage) Thomas Fulford, Robert Willoughby, John Crocker, Giles Daubenay, Thomas Arundel, Henry Bodrugan, Nicholas Latimer, John St Lo, Richard Beauchamp, William Berkeley and Roger Tocotes; and esquires and gentlemen William Uvedale, William Paulet, John Biconell, Edward Courtenay, William Hody and William Twynyho; from the South East, knights John Guildford, Thomas Lewkenor and his uncle Richard, John Wood, William Brandon, William Knyvett and Nicholas Gaynesford ; in the Central South, John and William Norris, Thomas Delamare, Richard Harcourt and William Stonor. Importantly (as with the peace commissioners) their selection indicates that Richard was still actively cultivating the leading gentry and was not prepared, at this stage, to

36. For Hungerford, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 87, 259; for Uvedale, *ibid.*, p. 77 and *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 1; for Bourgchier, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 244; for Audley and Halwell, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 213; for Arundel, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 88 and for Guildford, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 19.

37. For Delamares and Croft, *Wedgwood*, pp. 239, 419.

38. There were few unfamiliar additions in June and July and most, apart from the leading nobles - Buckingham, Francis, Viscount Lovell and John, duke of Norfolk - were careerist lawyers or local identities promoted by the crown.

reinforce county administration with numbers of his own northern servants. Notable omissions however, include Fogge and the Hautes, Sir George Brown and esquire John Cheyney.

CHAPTER 11

DISLOCATION: COURT AND COUNTY, NOVEMBER 1483 - AUGUST 1485

While numerous gentry in the South and further afield had lost patronage, it is significant, though not surprising, that the most powerful southern knights and esquires were singled out for special treatment. These were the men whose experience was essential to Richard in maintaining the household and governing the regions. Demonstrably the local pruning from May until early October, the bench omissions and forfeitures of grants and privileges which did occur were not sufficient to create among the future rebels a climate of change and uncertainty - in terms, that is, of their livelihood. Few Woodville colleagues and proteges were penalised by Richard, and while the removal of patronage from some reflected Richard's doubt and mistrust, initially, it may in part have been merely a matter of personal preference. Yet as the weeks went by there were signs in the regions and at court that rumour and intrigue were rife, and while this did not translate into wholesale changes in government, a steady trickle of disaffection (or perceived disaffection) fed Richard's fears, and from July prompted him to institute commissions of oyer and terminer in and around the capital and saw executions and further culling of county commissions. The household underwent few changes. It is true that the dismissal of Fogge, Cheyney and St Leger removed three of the most powerful of the dead King's servants and regional power-brokers and indicates that Richard was not at ease with all of Edward's household men. In August, however, when the leading gentry were called to assess the subsidy in the South, St Leger was among them although Cheyney, George Brown, Fogge and William Haute were excluded. Undeniably, however, most leading gentry were actively and deliberately cultivated by the King, many, in fact, receiving their richest patronage in the period following Edward's death. Of all the former King's servants, the future rebels had least reason to rebel.

Yet within weeks Richard was forced to replace these men; over forty percent of leading royal officials in the South - receivers, stewards, constables and auditors, revenue collectors and local administrators, sheriffs and peace commissioners, men who had also served at court, attending the King and keeping him informed of county life and local concerns. The changes set in train by the rebellion were immense, at the centre and particularly in the regions.

By reference to the shrievalty in 1482 and the peace commissions immediately before 'Buckingham's rebellion', the following discussion will focus on the calibre of the sample

rebels. How serious was the dislocation in the South caused by the rising and just who was Richard left with in the counties?¹

The survey of the sheriffs appointed between 1478 and 1482 and final peace commissions of Edward IV's reign revealed that 46% and 35% (respectively) of leading southern gentry rebelled,² and not surprisingly a survey of sheriffs in office from November 1482 and those appointed to the bench prior to 'Buckingham's rebellion' reveals similar percentages. Of the ten sheriffs appointed in the sample counties in November 1482, four rebelled: John Treffry (Cornwall), Robert Poyntz (Hampshire); Sir William Haute (Kent) and John Wingfield (Norfolk/Suffolk). In addition, Poyntz (as noted) was replaced in May by William Berkeley who also rebelled.³ In short exactly half the sheriffs selected for office prior to the revolt took part in the rebellion of 1483. They had held between them an impressive array of local offices and had a wealth of experience in the regions in duchy administration as constables, keepers and stewards of royal and noble estates, as well as in local government. Treffry, for example had been active in duchy administration and as a royal commissioner; Poyntz had been sheriff of Gloucestershire in 1468, 1476 and 1481; and had held important constabships such as that of St Briavel's, Gloucestershire, while William Berkeley, the most active of all, was sheriff of Hampshire in 1476, of Somerset/Dorset in 1477, and was constable and mayor of Southampton. Wingfield and Haute had also been busy royal officials in their respective counties.⁴

Importantly, however, the rebels held the closest household connections among the group of sheriffs: Robert Poyntz, son-in-law of Earl Rivers, was an esquire of the body by 1478.⁵ Sir William Haute, first cousin of Elizabeth Woodville, was, through his brother, Richard, (councillor of the Prince of Wales) and his nephew, also Richard (associated with the duke of York's household), prominent and influential at court.⁶ John Wingfield was an esquire of the body to Edward IV, while his uncle, Sir Robert (d. 1481) had been a knight of the body and

-
1. Part 2, Chapter 5 surveys the appointments to the shrievalty, 1477-82, and the peace commissions both before and after Richard's accession, in the context of the percentage of later rebels. The following discussion stresses the standing of the rebels, and focusses on the dislocation caused in the regions and at court by their removal.
 2. These men had been attainted or, having avoided attainder, had nevertheless been indicted in the various centres of revolt, and obtained nothing under Richard.
 3. The crown was not entirely happy with others, and Sir Henry Rose, for one, remained off the bench until June, 1484.
 4. See above, Part 2, Chapter 5.
 5. For Poyntz, *Memorials*, no. 86.
 6. Ross, *Richard III*, p. 107; Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 204-5.

controller of the household; William Berkeley was an esquire of the body under Edward, while John Treffry, termed esquire in 1483, had been one of Edward's grooms.⁷ Of the remaining sheriffs Sir William Courtenay was no doubt the most experienced in local government and had the strongest ties at court. But at Edward's death the latter were only through associates, while the former, through the 1470s to 1483 fell far short of the workload shouldered by many of the rebels. Peace commissioner until 1477, and then from 1480, he was on assorted commissions in Devon in Edward's last years, his career capped by his selection as sheriff.⁸ Of the rest, none had discoverable court connections of value and were local men of some note, but of comparatively little substance: Sir Alexander Baynham was kinsman of Thomas Baynham, who had held the custody of St Briavel's with Poyntz and then Berkeley; Nicholas Crowmer esquire of Great Torrington, Devon, was possibly related to Sir James Crowmer of Tunstall, Kent, (whose relations with Richard III 'were not amiable'), while Thomas Kingston and Henry Long had served Edward IV in the West on various local commissions but received little under Richard, their careers peaking in 1482.⁹

The sheriffs who rose were among the regional powers on whom Edward had relied for intelligence from the counties; their own power and local standing, peace-keeping offices and posts in royal estate-management saw them well-placed - as court gentry - to inform the King in this capacity. As household men they also provided an avenue for prospective household servants to the monarch.¹⁰ It was they who kept wide-open the channels of communication between the King and the country. With their rebellion this nexus was broken. Quantitatively, this break is more strongly underlined by the removal of the 'men of substance' from the peace commissions. While the discussion has already demonstrated the impressive number of household servants who rose against Richard III, it is proposed to quantify the number based again on the peace commissions in the selected counties, immediately before the rising. Given that the King selected the 'pre-eminent men of the shire' for the bench, what was the status of

7. For Wingfield and Treffry, see above, Part 2, Chapter 4; *Rot Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 246; Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 364.

8. Courtenay became a knight of the body under Richard, yet may also have suffered through the King's promotion of his northern servants in the South West: Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 288.

9. For Baynham, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p.12; for Crowmer, *ibid.*, p. 54 and *Wedgwood*, p. 242; for Long, *Wedgwood*, p. 550; Long was a lawyer of Wraxall, Wiltshire and moved in the Hungerford's circle; for Thomas Kingston of Childrey, Berkshire, who was knighted by Richard, see *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 113.

10. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 182.

the rebels and those remaining servants, and how did Richard cope with the shortage of court gentry in the counties? ¹¹

Excluding nobles and ecclesiastics, 175 positions were occupied on the bench from June through to September 1483.¹² An analysis of these positions reveals that seventy-three places were held by careerist and county lawyers, whose calling accounted for their commission and who, as a group, side-stepped the rising.¹³ Of the remaining 102, thirty-three men attainted or listed as rebels occupied thirty-six places. In addition, twenty-six occupants were removed directly after the rising, suggesting their implication at least. Of the rebels, all had strong ties at court either through their own positions within the royal household and bureaucracy, or through those of immediate kinsmen. They also held significant posts in royal estate-management, and as escheators, collectors of taxes and an array of lesser positions. Of the remaining thirty-eight places (excluding the twenty-six immediately omitted), the vast majority had served Edward IV at court, in important estate-management posts and in an array of lesser positions in the regions.¹⁴ Yet again, as with the sheriffs, the rebels had much weightier connections with court than the non-rebels. Twenty-one of the thirty-six (rebel) positions were held by knights, five of whom were knights of the body to Edward IV; ten were held by esquires, seven of whom were esquires of the body, and one termed king's esquire.¹⁵ Of the thirty-eight non-rebels, sixteen were knights, only one of whom, Sir Gilbert Debenham, had been a knight of the body under Edward, and twenty were esquires of whom John Sapcote alone was Edward's esquire.¹⁶ This calculation demonstrates (once again) that the leading gentry both at court and in the counties rebelled ; and in the case of the bench appointments (unlike Edward's last commissions) these men had been selected and approved of by Richard III just weeks before 'Buckingham's rebellion'.

11. For the counties selected for the study, see above, Part 3, Chapter 5, and Appendix 4 for a breakdown of the commissions.

12. See above, Part 2, Chapter 5, where it has been demonstrated that many others in the South and elsewhere who were not officially proscribed were dropped from the bench.

13. This figure excludes John Higgons, a local lawyer who was attainted.

14. See Appendix 4. It should be noted that of the 66, a further 26 men were dropped from the bench, suggesting their implication in the revolt at least.

15. This figure excludes Sir William Berkeley, knighted at Richard's coronation, who has been included in 'esquires'. The five knights of the body occupied six places.

16. Sir Richard Croft was an esquire of the body. This does not take into account several esquires who, as lawyers, do not account. In addition at least eight men were promoted by Richard.

As with Edward's last commissions in the southern counties, thirty-five percent of Richard's bench selections rebelled; while the percentage soars to sixty-one with the inclusion of those stood down directly after the rising. However percentages can be misleading. In terms of court status and regional service these men far outdistanced almost all of their colleagues who avoided the rising (with the exception of some legal careerists) and remained in office. This was to have dire consequences as the King was hard pressed to replace the rebels in a number of counties with men of like stature. Focussing on Hampshire and casting a wide net, R. Horrox has demonstrated both the depth and breadth of the crisis for Richard. Seven attainted rebels: Uvedale, Kelsale, Williams, Overy, Fesaunt, Knight and Berkeley were Hampshire men or had landed interests there. On the Hampshire peace commission of 26 June, 1483, two gentry rebelled and six did not. As Horrox notes, the status of the men varied considerably and of the non-rebels none had held other key offices in Hampshire; yet the seven rebels, men of calibre, held among them the following positions: sheriff, mayor of Southampton, supervisor and a customer in a port there, and a custodian of the royal castles of Southampton and Porchester. Again, the rebels also had the strongest court connections, four being household servants of Edward IV.¹⁷ This was the pattern from Kent through to Cornwall, and Richard cannot have been unaware that in some counties before the rising the bench had been comprised of attainted rebels and those implicated (apart from the legal careerists) almost exclusively. This created a serious shortfall of local talent in areas of the South, and at Westminster, which the King was never able successfully to meet.

The severance of connections between court and county and the removal from the bench of the men best qualified to serve the crown had serious ramifications for Richard later in his reign. The problem was critical in a number of counties including Somerset, Kent and Berkshire. In Somerset, for instance, Sir Giles Daubenay (appointed to the August 26 commission) attainted with John Higgons, was the only commissioner - apart from the leading lawyers (some of whom were themselves involved in the revolt) - with both local and court appointments.¹⁸ Seven officers were legal careerists, six of whom were local: Sir William Paulet, Thomas Tremayle (serjeant-at-law), John Fitzjames, John Chokke, William Hody (listed as a rebel) and John Biconell; the seventh, John Catesby, was from Northamptonshire and Warwickshire. Paulet, Hody and Biconell were subsequently dropped with two of the remainder, Paulet's son William (father and brother of attainted rebel Amias Paulet) and Sir John Newton. Those omitted had held numerous and important offices. Newton, son of Sir Richard, chief justice of the common pleas, had served in the West Country from the early 1450s representing the county as an elector, peace commissioner and sheriff. Although on commissions of array in May and

17. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 179.

18. John Higgons was himself a local lawyer of some standing.

December, 1484, he was never restored to the bench by Richard.¹⁹ Biconell and Hody had represented Somerset, Dorset and numerous boroughs and were electors in both counties and peace commissioners in others; Biconell had been controller of the customs in London, sheriff of Somerset and Dorset and a royal steward in Somerset from 1461.²⁰ Apart from the remaining local lawyers - Thomas Tremayle, John Fitzjames and John Chokke - themselves active in local government, the only officers from this commission who continued to serve the crown were Robert Stowell, a local commissioner and William Colowe of Sydling, Dorset, promoted by Richard in a number of southern counties. Neither man approached the others in terms of office-holding.²¹

Yet Daubenay had by far the most impressive record. Sheriff of Somerset and Dorset in 1474 and 1480, he was under-sheriff of Cornwall in 1476, and sheriff of Devon in 1481; on the bench in Somerset from 1475, he represented the county in 1478 where he was also royal steward, constable and keeper. More importantly, none came close to Daubenay's status at court. From an almost unbroken line of knights for over a century, he was an esquire of the body in 1477 and created knight of the body in 1480.²² Men of Daubenay's stature were not easily replaced. In the counties Sir Giles had far more than local importance; his status had regional dimensions, which, complemented by his household posts had made him one of Edward's leading knights in the South whom Richard could not hope to replace.²³

19. Wedgwood, pp. 631-2; *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, pp. 22, 36, 55, 124. See also above, Part 2 Chapter 5, for Newton.

20. Wedgwood, pp. 74, 460, 480.

21. Stowell was on various commissions through the 1470s in Somerset including the April 1483 subsidy commission: *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 353, and was associated with the likes of Daubenay, Biconell and others: *The Registers of Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1466-1491, and Richard Fox, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1492-1494*, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte, Vol. LII (1937), no 235. Colowe was probably a lawyer like his brother John, which would account for his promotion in a number of southern counties under Richard, see Wedgwood, p. 148 and *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 571-2. Somerset's Thomas Tremayle was a serjeant-at-law by 1468; he represented Bridport, Bridgwater and Lyme Regis. As a legal careerist he was a J.P. in Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Worcestershire, Gloucestershire and Staffordshire: Wedgwood, pp. 867-8. Chokke, the son of Sir Richard, justice of the common pleas (d. 1483) was beginning to make his mark in 1483; while Fitzjames was a local lawyer of more modest office; J.P. of Somerset and of the quorum in 1479: Wedgwood, p. 373.

22. Wedgwood, pp. 259-60; *Extant Documents*, p. 332; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 47, 177, 337.

23. See below for further discussion concerning Richard's attempts and problems in replacing the regional power-brokers.

This is borne out by the local appointments after the rising: Edmund Gorges, son-in-law of John Howard, duke of Norfolk, and a man of consequence in Somerset and Wiltshire; Sir Reginald Stourton; John Wadham; legal careerists such as Richard's attorney general, Morgan Kydwelly; and lesser men such as Thomas Champneys and John Portman; none of whom matched Daubenay in terms of wealth and standing, regional influence or court connections.²⁴

In Berkshire the situation was more critical still. Already omitted by July were Sir Richard Woodville and John Cheyney's brother Alexander, while three of the nine remaining commissioners rebelled: Sir William Norris (knight of the body), his brother, John (esquire of the body), and Sir Thomas Delamare. The rest were all legal careerists including Humphrey Starkey, chief baron of the Exchequer and two serjeants-at-law, Thomas Wood and Thomas Tremayle. Unrivalled in terms of local office, William Norris was also the region's leading household knight. His revolt with his brother and Delamare left a chasm which Richard was unable to fill with local men. In fact two of the three added to the December commission were known outsiders: Northamptonshire lawyer, William Catesby, a knight of the body under Richard, and Edward Franke of Knighton, Richmondshire, an associate of Francis, Viscount Lovell.²⁵

Even in Kent, with its high percentage (comparatively speaking) of household knights, Richard was 'caught short' after the rising. Already without Sir William and Richard Haute, three of the fifteen members on the 30 July commission were attainted - knights Thomas Bourghier, John Fogge and John Guildford - while Sir John Scott and Roger Brent were implicated. In terms of county and regional offices, the rebels had held numerous and important posts, and their court connections speak for themselves: a knight of the body, treasurer of the household, keeper of the wardrobe, two king's councillors, a controller of the household, marshal of the marshalsea and an usher of the chamber. His brother's men and among the most talented servants in the South, they had been viewed by Richard in July as those best qualified to serve the crown. Given that Kent was the traditional training ground for household servants and king's retainers their rebellion should not, perhaps, have created the same problems for Richard as in Somerset or Berkshire, yet the remaining royal servants whom he was prepared to trust lacked the local power and expertise of the rebels.²⁶ Of the local men Richard Lee, a

24. For Gorges, *Memorials*, no. 276; Champneys was of Frome, and Portman of Orchard Portman, Somerset: *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, pp. 39, 160; Kidwelly of Dorset and Wiltshire, was an eminent lawyer and became Richard's attorney general: *Extant Documents*, pp. 364-5.

25. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 221; *C.F.R.*, 1471-85, no. 861; see also Appendix 4.

26. Brent remained off the bench until July, 1484, while Scott, father-in-law of Edward Poynings, and named as a rebel by Stow, despite his positions as king's councillor and treasurer of the

grocer, was a yeoman of the crown, alderman of London and former sheriff of Kent; Roger Appleton of Dartford had been customer in the county and victualler of the household; John Alfegh was a royal receiver along with Richard Page; Robert Reed of Chiddington was termed 'king's servant' while Reginald Sande had served the crown at Dover. Significantly, however, in all the counties, the remaining commissioners or subsequent additions lacked the solidity of the attainted rebels at the local and regional level in terms of wealth, power and status, and at the centre in terms of positions, contacts and clout. Along with their exodus from public life the rebels took knowledge and expertise acquired not simply in a lifetime but accumulated over the generations and impossible to replace.²⁷

R. Horrox makes the point that the Fiennes family was 'unusual' in producing 'royal favourites' who held household office over three generations, but points out that there are parallels: the Darcies of Maldon, Essex, and the Wingfields of Suffolk. In view of this type of service, she says the rebellion clearly 'brought some disruption to the established patterns of household service' - surely an understatement! As the discussion has demonstrated, the leading gentry could all boast generations of service, both regional and household, and clearly the removal of these families caused major disruption both 'to the established patterns of household service', and axiomatically, in the regions.²⁸ This is in part reflected in Horrox's own calculations on Richard's use of his northern retainers after the rising: twenty-eight of his knights of the body came from north of the Humber, compared with six under Edward IV. Moreover, his promotion and patronage of a large number of *parvenus* within the household after the rising highlights the shortfall of eminent gentry available to Richard because so many were either disaffected, or under suspicion.²⁹

household, was clearly involved in later trouble as his bond to Richard in March, 1485 indicates: C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1408; Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 105.

27. See below for the discussion on Richard's replacements on the bench in general, and especially the large number of northern gentry, recently promoted as knights and esquires of the body, who attempted to fill the gap in Kent.

28. Again, this point is made in regard to the 'sample' gentry of fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen, introduced in Part 2, Chapter 4.

29. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 264.

CHAPTER 12

RICHARD'S RESPONSE: PATTERNS OF PARDON, PATTERNS OF PUNISHMENT

There is, of course, colossal irony in the fact that the gentry who had least cause (in a mercenary sense) to rebel, led the rising.¹ It may also explain the severity of their punishment, and perhaps why they and not others were proscribed. Yet there is more to it than that. The King's response to 'Buckingham's rebellion' was, in fact, ambivalent and reflects his predicament. On the one hand he was most probably forced to limit the number of attainders to one hundred; an unusually high figure passed at a single session of parliament, yet including just the top layer of gentry society involved. His 'leniency' in waiving the act for many more was not born of highmindedness or security but of necessity. As it was, he knew replacements for the regional leaders would be difficult, and for this reason most likely curtailed the number of attainders. Always insecure and by now well-aware of his unpopularity, he was also mindful not to antagonise - more than was humanly possible - powerful gentry circles in the regions. While the number of attainders was necessarily restricted, the treatment accorded the rebels, was, in the long-term, unprecedented and again reflects the bind in which the King found himself. While twenty-two of the attainted rebels and seven indicted who avoided attainder petitioned for and received pardons, few received even partial restoration of their estates, none peace commissions within their respective counties, nor offices within the household.² After the periods of political conflict in 1459-61 and 1469-71, attainders had occurred, men had died and forfeited estates and offices. Yet political society was flexible and even some of the most recalcitrant subjects were encouraged back into public life by the crown, sometimes within months of their disaffection. This was not the case with the 1483 rebels however. While a number were abroad, the crown made little effort with most who remained, and this despite growing tension within the regions over Richard's 'plantations' and within the household as opposition to the King grew.

In regard to the rebels, the petitions for pardon reflect the desire of a number to regain their former standing with the crown. Conversely, the flight to Brittany after the rising of men who might successfully have pleaded for their case, indicates their entrenched disaffection. In addition, the rebels' burgeoning numbers through 1484 - gentry who had not been implicated in 1483 - reflects the crown's impossible situation.

-
1. Again, the focus is on the 'sample' rebels: fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen selected for the study; see above Part 2, Chapter 4.
 2. Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 118-9.

Richard hit the rebels hard. While the attainders were not formalised until parliament sat in the following January, the King promptly confiscated all offices and seized the land not only of those attainted but of a number who were implicated. This in itself was not unusual, however. What was irregular was Richard's rush to redistribute the forfeited offices and estates. Forced to replace the top echelons of the southern gentry with his own retainers from the North, within weeks he began to regrant a vast array of royal offices in the counties, often under the proviso 'as long as the King pleases'.³ Loyalty, or perceived loyalty, was the price and withdrawal of office was in Richard's power. Yet royal office in itself was no guarantee of status and local acceptance. As the discussion has demonstrated the basis of the gentry's power was vested in the land, and it was this which gave the leading knights and esquires their regional status and political power. While the grant of office gave the recipient an entree into the county, it meant little else. And in his desperation to confer status on his 'new' servants, the King bypassed the legal conventions of formally identifying the owner of the forfeited estates and thus failed to give the forfeiture legal sanction.⁴ Just how successful this policy was is a point for later discussion. Yet it is arguable that Richard never enjoyed even a short period of 'unchallenged authority',⁵ and likely that he came quickly to realise that status and political acceptance could not be conferred in this way. They, like the land itself were not obtained in a lifetime, but won over the generations.⁶

The present discussion is concerned with the King's response to the rebellion in an immediate sense: his treatment of the rebels and the patterns both of pardon and punishment. What does Richard's response tell us about the ramifications of the 1483 rebellion?

The King imposed five types of penalty in the aftermath of the revolt: attainders, pardons, fines, bonds and imprisonment. The form of punishment meted out to individuals perhaps owed as much to geographical factors, timing and connection as to the scale or degree of treason. A number of leading gentry clearly involved in the rising escaped attainder - men who are listed in the Act of Attainder as participants in the revolt, but are not included in the list of those attainted.⁷ This in part reflects the royal response to the rebellion, and, being in the right place at the right time. Richard's lieutenants - John Howard, duke of Norfolk, his son, the earl of Surrey and Lord Cobham took charge of defending London from attack, and of pursuing the

3. Horrox, *op.cit.*, pp. 182-3.

4. Wolffe, *The Royal Demesne in English History*, p. 193; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 187.

5. Horrox, *ibid.*, p. 273.

6. See below for a discussion of the placement of Richard's northern servants in the South.

7. See above, Part 2, Chapter 5, for the names (and for those which follow) of the men who escaped attainder but who were indicted in the centres of revolt before the King's officials.

rebels through Kent, Surrey and Sussex. As the rebels were rounded up, some were able to plead for their case to Norfolk, Surrey and others whose lordship they had known over the years. John Wingfield, for example, avoided attainder by conveying to Richard his claim to the Mowbray inheritance, to the advantage of John Howard, duke of Norfolk and Thomas, Lord Stanley.⁸ Sir William Brandon no doubt also did the same, though his son, William was attainted. Others in the East indicted for revolt, but escaping attainder include William Cheyney, Anthony Brown, Robert Brent, Sir Thomas Bourgchier, Sir William Haute, John Isley, John Norris and Ralph Tykull. Similarly Sir William Knyvet, who rebelled with Buckingham at Brecon (and probably made for home soon after) also escaped attainder. In return he relinquished four manors in Norfolk, including Buckenham, to Sir James Tyrell for which he was to have received £300 from Richard; money he apparently never saw.⁹

This was also the pattern in the South West where prominent gentry who avoided attainder had either pulled back from revolt before the King's lieutenants arrived, or else submitted (with success) to Lord Scrope and other royal officials at Exeter and Torrington. Among them were knights Thomas Fulford and John Crocker, esquires Thomas Audley, John Cheverell, Hugh Lutterell and William Twynyho, and gentlemen James Bonythen, Thomas Brandon, Robert Burnaby, Thomas Greenfield, William Hody, Richard and Robert Morton, and Bartholomew St Leger. Conversely, the majority of the exiles also came from the South West, including many who raised their standard at Bodmin in early November. With others they chose or were forced into flight abroad, and assisted by good harbours and sympathetic merchants, joined Henry Tudor in Brittany: Thomas Arundel and Edward Courtenay, with the latter's cousins, Peter, bishop of Exeter, and Walter Courtenay, and lesser men including Ralph Arundell, Geoffrey Beauchamp, Remfry Densell, John Rosogan and Thomas Borlase.¹⁰ Others who found escape the only option include the marquis of Dorset and his son, Thomas Grey, Sir Robert Willoughby, John Halwell, Thomas Brandon and William Froste.

The number of attainers resulting from the Newbury and Salisbury sectors contrasts sharply with Exeter and Maidstone, in that all those listed in the act from the former sectors were attainted.¹¹ There was no plea-bargaining in the Central South, perhaps due to the speed of the royal advance and uncertainty among the rebels. At Newbury, unsure and without intelligence, their only option was to flee in the face of Richard's army; while a number in the

8. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 285; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 110; *C.C.R.*, 1476-85, nos. 84, 1380.

9. *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 298; *Extant Documents*, p. 364.

10. See above, Part 2, Chapter 5, for more detail.

11. Two knights, Richard Enderby and John Donne were indicted but apparently talked their way out of attainder.

same predicament further south at Salisbury, prepared their passage to Brittany from one of the available ports, or entered sanctuary at Beaulieu Abbey (having been joined no doubt, by some Newbury men) rather than test the water with Richard.¹² This is reflected in the names of those who joined Henry Tudor in Brittany: Sir Giles Daubenay and John Cheyney with two of his brothers, and Newbury rebels Edmund Hampden and John Harcourt.¹³

In the south-western sectors of revolt, the rebels, with fewer options (less time and without access to powerful allies) than their south-eastern compatriots, might still, perhaps, have avoided attainder if they had so desired. While some in the West and more in the East threw themselves on the King's mercy and avoided attainder, others, clearly disaffected, chose exile. Certainly in the South East, without the threat of the King himself bearing down, the rebels were better-placed to bargain through the good offices of powerful sponsors. Yet even here, a number, including Richard Guildford and Edward Poynings, who led the risings, chose to flee abroad.¹⁴

While the attainders were in part determined by the rebels' own attitude in the days after their treason, the procedure for pardons varied accordingly and presents some interesting points for discussion. Pardons, generally, reflect both the wishes of the recipient and the crown; and while it was most uncommon for the crown to grant an 'unsolicited' pardon under the great seal, the King might publicise the fact that petitions from former rebels would be accepted.¹⁵ In relation to those who avoided attainder, there seem to have been two steps by way of securing a formal pardon. After the rebellion, for example, the King was clearly prepared to receive rebels who submitted to him and it is likely that some of the men - those who subsequently escaped attainder - who were indicted in the West before Scrope, and in the East before Norfolk, made some approach to him either personally or through a powerful patron, receiving an informal pardon in this way within days of their treason. In fact while at Beaulieu Abbey,

12. For example John Cheyney (Salisbury) and Sir William Norris (Newbury) allegedly later joined forces: Part 2, Chapter 5.

13. Berkeley is cited by Griffiths and Thomas as having crossed to Brittany with John Harcourt, yet this is unlikely as he in fact petitioned for pardon and bound himself to obey the King's appointment of a suitable abode: C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1242; P.R.O., C 244/134/31; see above Part 2, Chapter 5, for details on those in exile.

14. Guildford's father, Sir John, was luckier than his comrade, Sir George Brown (executed by Richard) and had been sheltered with Brown by Walter Roberd at Maidstone. Later captured, he was tried, attainted, served a term in prison, yet managed to escape with his life: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 465; *Extant Documents*, p. 400; Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 159.

15. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 273; see also above, Part 2, Chapter 5, for further information on pardons.

Hampshire in November 1483, the King drew up a list of rebels he was prepared to pardon; no doubt men in sanctuary there such as Robert Poyntz. He prepared a similar list at Nottingham in the Spring of 1484. Men could also sue for a pardon under the great seal out of chancery. Through this process Richard could have pardoned many men who did not bother seeking a formal certificate of pardon. Yet others formally approached the crown for a pardon 'in chancery'.¹⁶ For those who submitted to Scrope and Norfolk and avoided attainder, including Fulford, Crocker and others in the West, and William Cheyney, Thomas Brown, Brandon and more in the East, pardons were formally recorded in February 1484. Others - who wavered - paid a price. John Norris, whose kinsman Viscount Lovell may well have sponsored him, secured a pardon and avoided attainder. Conversely, however, his brother, Sir William's pardon failed to pass the great seal in time. This was also the case with a number of others including the Cheyney brothers and the Brandons.¹⁷

For those under attainder like William Norris who sought a pardon, the process was more complex and protracted. To begin with a pardon did not mean either removal of the sentence or restoration of land, yet it cancelled the death sentence, brought the subject 'within the law' and enabled the recipient to receive care from kinfolk without threat of penalty.¹⁸ Before the pardon passed the great seal however, there were criteria to be met (quite possibly a number of these criteria also applied to those who escaped attainder). Petitioners had to appoint guarantors who would vouchsafe their continued obedience. They were often placed on good behaviour bonds and told where to live and with whom. When these terms had been arranged and the crown petitioned, subjects then had to wait upon the King's good grace.¹⁹

These conditions applied to a number of the attainted rebels who were pardoned in 1484. From the West, Sir William Berkeley of Beverstone was bound in 2000 marks to the King, and to live in a place appointed by him. John St Lo was bound in 1000 marks to Richard, as was Nicholas Latimer.²⁰ In the South East Sir Thomas Lewkenor, also bound in 1000 marks to the King, was ordered to live with his brother-in-law, John Wood, treasurer of England. Such was his role in the rising that Kent was off-limits to him. Likewise Walter Hungerford's bond was

16. Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 273-4; Richmond, '1485 and all that, or what was going on at the Battle of Bosworth?' p. 198, n. 60; P.R.O., C 81/153/48.

17. C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 371, 458; B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 181; B.L.H.M., Vol. 2, p. 91; see also Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 274-5 and Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster*, p. 102 and n.

18. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 274.

19. See for example the reference to Sir William Norris's pardon in 1471: *Stonor Letters*, Vol. 1, no. 115.

20. B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 181; C.C.R., 1476-85, nos. 1243, 1244.

1000 marks, while Nicholas and John Gaynesford were bound in 100 marks and pardoned in July 1484.²¹

Given their subsequent activity, the petitioners were clearly not investing in Richard's reign or demonstrating their future loyalty to the regime. Berkeley for one fled England soon after his pardon was issued, forfeiting his recognisance and embarrassing his sureties, his uncle Edward Berkeley and his brother-in-law, John Lord Stourton; while John Harcourt who received a pardon by default, remained in exile with Henry Tudor.²²

The process of securing a pardon was undoubtedly coloured with corruption, and for those who escaped attainder, 'fines' as well as forfeits were another condition of pardon. In addition to losing his Norfolk lands, Knyvet paid a hefty 700 marks to Richard and 100 marks to the Queen. Likewise John Forster was pressured to forfeit land (marked out for Sir Robert Brackenbury) in return for his pardon.²³ And there were doubtless other instances of such persuasion.

Presumably most under attainder who received pardons had initiated the action.²⁴ However not all who petitioned had immediate success, illustrating the crown's attitude to some of the more 'hardened' dissidents. In this context it may be instructive to list the sample rebels and their pardons - in their centre of revolt. From the Maidstone sector, William Brandon (March 1484), Robert Brewes (February 1484), Thomas Fiennes (July 1484), John Fogge (February 1485), John and Nicholas Gaynesford (July 1484), Richard Haute (March 1485) and Sir Thomas Lewkenor (May 1484).²⁵ From Newbury, Sir William Berkeley (May 1484), Sir Thomas Delamare (April 1484), John Harcourt (April 1484), Roger Kelsale (April 1484), Sir William Norris (early in 1484), William Uvedale (early in 1484), Amias Paulet (May 1485) and Sir Roger Tocotes (January 1485). From Salisbury, knights Walter Hungerford, Nicholas Latimer and John St Lo, all pardoned in April 1484 and lawyer, Michael Skilling (January 1485), and finally from Exeter, East Anglian lawyer Thomas Lovell and John Trevelyan. In view of their role in the revolt it is little surprising that leading rebels and regional leaders

21. Conway, *op.cit.*, p. 108; C.C.R., 1476-85, nos. 1242, 1245, 1258, 1259.

22. *Extant Documents*, p. 312; P.R.O., C81/1392/27; C.C.R., nos. 1393, 1412; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 273.

23. *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, pp. 332-3; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 3, p. 145.

24. R. Horrox estimates that fourteen of the attainted rebels petitioned for pardon in the five months following parliament's first sitting: Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 274. There were no doubt some in exile like John Harcourt, whose relatives petitioned for them.

25. Fiennes was undoubtedly sponsored by his brother, Richard's knight of the body, Robert Fiennes: Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 264.

such as Fogge, Haute and Tocotes were not recognised by the crown until 1485; and reinforces the notion that with others like Paulet, whose brother and father had lost early patronage under Richard, they remained disaffected or were perceived as such.

Again, the pardons like the attainders reflect the rebels' own conduct after the revolt, as well as the attitude of the crown. While the number of attainders (comparatively speaking) was higher among the Newbury and Salisbury rebels, due both to circumstance and resolution, the pardons show a clear pattern of punishment by the crown and a wide discrepancy between the South East and South West. Of the attainted Exeter gentry only Lovell, a lawyer, and Trevelyan received pardons; the others apparently neither petitioned nor were approached by the crown: knights Thomas Arundel and Robert Willoughby and esquires Edward and Walter Courtenay, John Halwell, Richard Nanfan, John Treffry and John Welles. This was also the case at Salisbury among the leaders - John Cheyney and his brothers, Sir Giles Daubenay (and five of his servants), Thomas and John Melbourne and John Trenchard. Yet the majority of leading Kent rebels who remained in England received pardons, while those who stayed in exile in Brittany did not. Demonstrably the number of pardons issued to the gentry was conditioned by the number of exiles in Brittany - predominantly West Country gentry whose residence with Henry Tudor told the crown of their continued disaffection. These men had neither approached the crown, nor received concessions. This is evidenced by the leaders from other centres who were in exile such as Edmund Hampden (Newbury) and Richard Guildford (Maidstone), neither of whom (unlike their companions in revolt) received a pardon; in fact the only attainted leader neither pardoned nor in exile early in 1484 was Sir William Stonor.²⁶

In the South West geographical reasons, disenchantment and fear of retribution had all helped dictate the rebels' course of action after the rising, and with Richard bearing down, flight for many had seemed the best option. Yet the dissidents from the West and some from the East who had raised their standard were not initially strong proponents of Henry Tudor's claim. They were, in fact, strong opponents of Richard III. When the revolt failed, they defiantly grouped around Henry Tudor, who, for the first time became a powerful political contender for the English crown. There was undoubtedly great symbolic significance in the ceremony on Christmas day at Rennes Cathedral in which oaths were sworn by Henry, who had promised to marry Elisabeth of York, and the gentry, who in return, promised their loyalty to the future King.²⁷ Richard III was well aware of the expanding fraternity in Brittany, much of whose support emanated from the West, and the continued threat of insurrection both from here and at home. Despite inquisitions and executions, disaffection, particularly West Country

²⁶. For pardons of rebels, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 67-288.

²⁷. Ross, *Richard III*, p. 196; Bennett, *op.cit.*, pp. 60-2; Griffiths and Thomas, *op.cit.*, pp. 103-5.

disaffection flourished, augmenting both the colony in exile, and the King's fears. Yet there were other factors at play.

If Richard had wanted to entice the gentry home early in 1484, or for that matter, seriously cultivate those who had remained in England, he was in a bind. Having redistributed the rebels' offices and lands among a number of his northern servants, taking the traditional basis of power from entrenched gentry families in his attempt to confer on them status and political acceptance, how could he remove their props without alienating them? Conversely, given the disaffection of the southern gentry which underlined Richard's vulnerability, he could not afford to re-employ the rebels either at court or in the regions.²⁸ While C. Ross notes that the number of exiles was proportionately stronger in the South West where accordingly the King placed most of his servants, yet Richard was forced to replace the expertise of those who remained at home. Without the services of forty percent of regional leaders and household powers, the scheme he introduced to reinforce political society and the rewards used to confer political status proved in the short term, untenable and in the long-term, Richard's ruin.

Appointed to the household as knights and esquires of the body, men from the North were added to the bench in the South, employed as sheriffs and placed on inquests after the rising.²⁹ A few retainers had accompanied Richard south in May 1483, among them Richard Ratcliffe of Sedbury, Yorkshire (who enjoyed an almost unparalleled pre-eminence with the King), Sir Ralph Ashton of Lancashire, who had married into Kent society in early June and Robert Brackenbury.³⁰ Some including John Huddleston and Geoffrey Franke could well have come south at this time. In Yorkshire with the King in September, they and more returned with Richard to confront the rebels in October and were introduced into the regions within weeks of the rising; in the South West, Huddleston, Franke, Sir Thomas Markenfield and Edward Redman; while peers introduced here include Richard, Lord Fitzhugh from Richmondshire and John Lord Scrope of Bolton; in the Central South, Sir Christopher Warde, William Mirfield and Sir John Saville, and in the South East, knights Ralph Bigod, Marmaduke Constable and

²⁸. Ross, *Richard III*, p. 120.

²⁹. Only two of Richard's retainers in the South were employed by him before 1483, Ratcliffe of Sedbury, Yorkshire and of Cumberland, created a knight of the body in October, 1483 and Ashton, a knight of the body by March, 1484. Huddleston and Franke were esquires of the body by September and October, respectively. Markenfield became a knight of the body soon after.

³⁰. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, pp. 174-5; Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 144-5.

Robert Percy. Others from the North employed in the South include William Mauleverer and William Harrington, together with Lancashire's Edward Stanley.³¹

In local government the King's dependence on his northern retainers is evident in the appointments to the bench after the rising. Whereas only two of the sixteen knights (non-rebels) in the sample counties were peace commissioners before the rising, Ratcliffe in Gloucestershire and Surrey, and Ashton in Kent, this changed dramatically from December, 1483.³² Joining the latter in Kent for example were Sir Marmaduke Constable, Ralph Bigod, Henry Lord Grey of Codnor and later, knights Edward Stanley, John Savage, William Harrington, Richard Ashton, Robert Brackenbury and William Malyverer.³³ The intended role of the 'new' gentry as replacements for the regional leaders is evident in Edward Redman's commissions and offices; sheriff of Somerset-Dorset in November 1483, he was on the Wiltshire bench in December, a commissioner of arrest and imprisonment in Devon-Cornwall in November, and of array and oyer and terminer in Devon and Wiltshire in May and July, 1484.³⁴

For their services the northern gentry received lavish rewards. Sir Richard Ratcliffe, for example, obtained £666 worth of the earldom of Devon estates along with Sir Robert Willoughby's manors of Broke and Southwick in Wiltshire; his brother, Edward received other Willoughby estates to the value of £100 annually. John Musgrave was given four Wiltshire manors amounting to £102; Sir Thomas Markenfield was granted eight Somerset manors worth £100 per annum; John Nesfield was given Sir Walter Hungerford's Wiltshire estates totalling more than £100 yearly; while Edward Redman's grants here, including former Tocotes and Edgecombe lands, totalled at least £84. Lord Fitzhugh received manors in Somerset, Wiltshire and Dorset amounting to over £136, while Lord Scrope also obtained a stake in the West, worth £206 yearly.³⁵ Sir Thomas Everingham was favoured with West Country and

31. K. Dockray, 'Richard III and the Yorkshire Gentry', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law* (London, 1986), p. 48; Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 175, 178, 225, 286.

32. See above, Chapter 8 for the sample peace commissions appointed by Richard before the rebellion. Horrox notes that Ratcliffe was only on the Surrey bench, but he or a namesake, appears also on the Gloucestershire bench: Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 202-3.

33. C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 563.

34. C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 371, 399, 488, 493, 501, 577; *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, p. 124; Dockray, *op.cit.*

35. Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 119, 121; for Nesfield, *V.C.H., Wiltshire*, Vol. 10, p. 55; for Redman's manor, formerly the property of Tocotes, *ibid.*, p. 165; see also Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 305. For Fitzhugh, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 109; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 119-20; Vol. 3, p. 237; for Scrope, *Extant Documents*, pp. 392-3. For more examples see A. J. Pollard, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower*, pp. 145-7.

Oxfordshire manors valued at over £200 yearly. In the South East, Richard's northern servants including knights John Savage, William Harrington, Marmaduke Constable, Edward Stanley and William Mauleverer, most probably received grants of land. The Gaynesfords' Surrey manors of Carshalton and Shalford Clifford went to John Kendal and Sir John Neville, respectively, while Ashton and Brackenbury profited handsomely. Ashton, appointed vice-constable of England on 24 October and empowered to try rebels without appeal and to move against those 'guilty of lese majeste', acquired vast estates in Kent both through marriage and royal patronage, including estates of Fogge and Brown; Robert Brackenbury was rewarded in Kent, Surrey and Sussex with lands of the deceased Earl Rivers, the Cheyneys and Walter Robert, which, with Buckinghamshire manors, totalled £137 a year.³⁶

The newly acquired landed wealth of the northerners was accompanied by the choice appointments on royal estates forfeited by the rebels. Some nine constabships in the South West changed hands in a few weeks after 'Buckingham's rebellion' including those of Exeter and Old Sarum which went to Lord Scrope and John Musgrave respectively. In addition Sir Thomas Mauleverer received the rule of the towns and ports of Plymouth and Saltash and the castle and manor of Plympton in Devon worth £120 per annum (formerly held by John Halwell). Everingham was given the same of Barnstaple together with the castle of Torrington in Devon, while Sir John Saville obtained Berkeley's position as governor of the Isle of Wight. Humphrey Stafford of Grafton received Tocotes's position as steward of Devizes, and Sir Richard Beauchamp's post as keeper of Chippenham and Melksham in Wiltshire. Further east, Durham's John Hoton became steward of Ringwood and Christchurch, formerly William Berkeley's posts, while the latter's custody of Carisbrooke Castle went to Saville. In Kent, Ashton obtained the stewardship of Witley, forfeited by Brown.³⁷

The scale of their rewards in terms of offices and estates can most effectively be gauged, however, by an assessment of the attainted rebels' returns through Richard's reign. Few had direct access to their forfeited lands; William Uvedale was able to farm one of his manors, while the Gaynesfords were granted the revenues from one of theirs.³⁸ In several cases kinsmen of rebels received forfeited estates which in effect gave control to the owner. This was the case with Sir Thomas Lewkenor and his uncle Richard; John Mordaunt, son-in-law of Sir Nicholas

36. For Everingham, Ross, *Richard III*, p. 120; for Ashton, Dockray, *op.cit.*, p. 47; C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1113; for Redman, Dockray, *ibid.*, p. 48; see also Ross, *ibid.*

37. For Ashton, V.C.H., Surrey, Vol. 3, p. 64; for Hoton, V.C.H., Hampshire, Vol. 4, p. 608 and Pollard, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower*, p. 146; for Saville, V.C.H., Hampshire, Vol. 5, p. 223; for Stafford, V.C.H., Wiltshire, Vol. 4, p. 437; V.C.H., Hampshire, Vol. 10, p. 242.

38. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 274.

Latimer; and perhaps Thomas Fiennes and his brother, Richard's knight of the body, Robert Fiennes.³⁹ The only discoverable case of an attainted rebel receiving a rebel kinsman's land concerns Richard Beauchamp, Lord St Amand who received Charlton, an estate belonging to his step-father, Sir Thomas Lewkenor, in March, 1484.⁴⁰ When, early in 1485, Richard began to extend his hand to leading rebels, Fogge was granted a life pardon and grant of some manors. Concessions had also been made to the widows and wives of his opponents including Anne Harcourt, whose husband John had died in exile in 1484 and Alexander Cheyney's wife, Florence, who was taken into the King's care 'for her good and virtuous disposition' and given the wardship of her husband's estates.⁴¹ Yet the rebels' gains were negligible considering the scale of their losses ; and most could expect little, especially if their land went to someone close to the crown.⁴² While a number of attainted rebels petitioned for their estates, doubtless all failed. A case in point concerns Thomas Lovell whose petition, recorded on 2 February 1485, was not supported.⁴³

In terms of grants of local office, the pattern is repeated; none of the attainted rebels was restored to the bench in his principal county or returned to work on other royal commissions or in estate-management.⁴⁴ As for the household, Robert Brent, a yeoman of the crown under Edward, is the only discoverable rebel to have been taken back into Richard's service in this capacity. In addition Richard was never sure of the loyalty of many servants who remained in the household, and men who had refrained from overt rebellion in 1483, such as Peter Curtis - temporarily removed from office in September 1483 - never fully enjoyed the crown's confidence. In a number of cases, however, men were removed from the regions yet retained in office at court, under Richard's watchful eye. Conversely, not all in the regions were trusted officials.⁴⁵

39. C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 527; C.C.R., 1476-85, nos. 1243, 1379.

40. *Extant Documents*, pp. 308-9.

41. B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 250, for Anne Harcourt; Ross, *Richard III*, p. 148. Buckingham's widow, Katherine, received an annuity of 200 marks for life from the lordship of Tonbridge in Kent: B.L.H.M., Vol. 1, p. 213.

42. Hicks, *op.cit.*, pp. 19-21; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 274. See Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 119-20, who says that about one-third of the rebels received at least part of their estates; this is debatable.

43. P.R.O., C 81 1531/14/22.

44. Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 118-9.

45. For Curtis who was again dismissed and entered sanctuary at Westminster in 1485, B.L.H.M., Vol. 2, p. 7; see below for further discussion on the household, bureaucrats and administrators whose loyalty was suspect.

The treatment by the crown of the October rebels was unprecedented; but then the nature of the revolt was unprecedented. The executions directly after the rising, confiscation of estates and offices, subsequent attainders, fines and bonds imposed on the gentry were standard penalties and not irregular in the context of fifteenth-century rebellion.⁴⁶ Yet the subsequent treatment of the rebels was. The urgency with which Richard carved up and redistributed the gentry's heritage, reflects the depth of his opposition - and his own state of mind. Further, the vast reorganisation of life in the regions and at court, set the tone for the rest of the reign. Caught fast, Richard could neither reinstate the rebel leaders and halt the disaffection, nor facilitate order in the regions through his new men. The directives to local communities, orders against livery and commissions of inquiry and arrest highlight the unrest in the South; while the steady trickle of leading gentry abroad, fed Richard's anxieties. Unable to halt the process which had begun with 'Buckingham's rebellion', the crown watched the exodus of the regional leaders to Brittany or below ground, and the slow erosion of regional life which ensued. In his attempt to restructure society using men from the North, it was not so much that Richard failed to appreciate the nature of political life in the South and the role of Edward IV's servants in the regions and at court - but that he simply had no choice.

⁴⁶. See Arthurson, *op.cit.*, pp. 11-15.

CHAPTER 13

'BUCKINGHAM'S REBELLION'

While the rebel gentry represented forty percent of their class, in their role both as household men and regional leaders the figure is much higher. In fact few service gentry with the rebels' wealth, standing and range of activities were not implicated, at least, in 'Buckingham's rebellion'. Richard III was aware of sedition in the regions which constantly undermined his power in the South; still the breadth and depth of the revolt when it came, confirmed, perhaps, his worst fears. Yet it was the treason of his partner in power, Henry, duke of Buckingham, which stunned the King. Smarting over the conduct of the gentry, most of whom he had cultivated in the weeks following Edward's death, he was confounded by the duke's defection. If the King struggled to comprehend the rebels' attitude after his coronation, how could he hope to fathom the treason of the man who had helped him take the crown just weeks earlier?

When Henry, duke of Buckingham defected from Richard and joined the rebellion against the King, he was the premier noble of the realm. Ironically his great rise had taken place simultaneously with Richard's successful bid for power. From May until October 1483, Buckingham could do no wrong. The recipient of the most lavish patronage at court, he appeared to be Richard's closest ally and confidant. Indeed there is clear evidence that Buckingham played a prominent role in Richard's usurpation. The most informed source for the period, the Second Continuation of the Crowland Chronicle, is not kind to the duke, who is represented as a sinister influence in the Chronicle. In stark contrast are the comments of Polydore Vergil, who like the continuator portrays the duke as Richard's close ally during these months, yet makes a sound effort to put a favourable light on Buckingham's involvement, and 'whether it were for fear or for obedience'...[he] 'held ever with him'. Richard's own reaction to Buckingham's defection, however, provides the historian with irrefutable evidence of the duke's former position, and his key role in events. Apprised of incipient rebellion on 11 October at Lincoln, the King sent the next day for the great seal held by Russell in London. Richard refers to 'our rebell and traitor the duke of Buckingham', and requests the great seal in order 'to resist and withstand his malicious purpose'. It is, in fact, this postscript with its emotional diatribe against the duke, referred to as 'he who had best cause to be true', which provides the clearest insight into Buckingham's role in his affairs. Perhaps the King's comments also hold the key to, in many ways the most baffling aspect of 1483, the duke of Buckingham's defection of October.¹

¹. P.R.O., C81/1392/6.

It is proposed firstly to examine the extraordinary position Buckingham achieved in May 1483, the wealth and offices conferred on him, and as a corollary, the power and patronage then at his disposal. His newly acquired status will be compared and contrasted with his political position under Edward IV in the 1470s; attention will focus on the unrest and intrigue which dogged Richard from April, his reaction to the disaffection, and the duke's high profile through the critical weeks until he parted from the King at the end of July. Buckingham's position at this time will be explored: the type of patronage he had dispensed since May, the nature of the contacts already forged by the Staffords, and the reality of his position in national politics. Finally, in view of the evidence, how best can his defection be explained?

Over a few months, in the summer of 1483, Buckingham attained a spectacular position in the affairs of English politics. With the accession of Edward V in April, the duke gave his firm support to Richard, duke of Gloucester in the latter's bid for power. This commitment to Richard III's usurpation was rewarded by an unprecedented array of offices in Wales and the West Country, and for a short time Buckingham's influence was supreme in these areas. In May 1483 the duke was appointed justiciar and chamberlain of North and South Wales, constable of all royal castles in the principality and in the counties of Shropshire, Herefordshire, Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire. In all the marcher lordships belonging to the crown he was given the offices of constable, steward and receiver. He was empowered to levy troops at his discretion in the principality of Wales and to issue commissions of array in the English counties where he was castellan. His powers included the right to appoint the sheriffs, escheators and all other officers in the counties of the principality, and he was given the supervision of the King's subjects in Wales and the Marches, Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire.² In July Buckingham's position was further strengthened with the acquisition of Earl Rivers's office of receiver-general of the duchy of Cornwall, a position the latter had held since Christmas 1473. The power this office would have afforded the duke in the South West was enormous. The Woodvilles' control of the Prince of Wales's affairs, particularly evident in Earl Rivers's position as governor and ruler of the Prince's household and head of his council, and the power he had wielded through exploitation of the duchy of Cornwall patronage, came at a stroke within Buckingham's orbit.³

As the discussion has demonstrated, prominent West Country gentry had benefited from duchy patronage through the agency of Rivers and his nephew, the marquis of Dorset, from a variety of duchy appointments in land management, to election to the shrievalty and selection

2. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, pp. 9-10, 13-14, 17, 31, 66, 69, 72; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 2; Pugh, *op.cit.*, p. 240.

3. See above, Part 2, Chapter 3, for the patronage which the Prince controlled as the duke of Cornwall.

for the shire. From the late 1470s Rivers and Dorset were actively cultivating West Country gentry in this manner and it is instructive that the leaders of the risings at Exeter and Bodmin were those clearly promoted by the 'Woodville caucus which dominated government for the first three weeks after Edward's death'.⁴ Indeed it is likely that Buckingham was in the process of filling the Woodvilles' shoes as controller or regulator of patronage in Wales, the Marches and the South West after their eclipse in April. Empowered with all the rights and privileges of the Prince's council, disbanded in May, Buckingham was doubtless keen to capitalise on his offices in these regions.⁵ In the South East too, a region largely free of great magnate control, the Woodvilles, as demonstrated, had household connections with a number of leading knights. With a principal seat, Mote, in Kent, the south-eastern counties had been the stamping ground of Elizabeth Woodville's father, Lord Rivers, and many of those who rose swiftly to prominence in Edward IV's early administration were close associates of Rivers and his son. The Woodvilles' downfall in April could well have afforded the duke the possibility of further power and patronage in the South East.

Significantly in July, Buckingham's claim to his second share of the Bohun inheritance was realised. Repeatedly refused by Edward IV, these lands enabled the duke to consolidate his already considerable holdings in southern England, and increased his finances to the tune of £1000 per annum. July was also the month in which he was confirmed in another of Rivers's former offices, that of constable of England, conferred on the latter for life in August 1467 with remainder to the earl's son for life.⁶ Held briefly by Gloucester, this office had almost hereditary significance for the Staffords. Buckingham's grandfather, the first duke, became constable of England in 1442, while duke Henry's son, Edward, wrangled with Henry VIII over his claim to the position in 1514.⁷ Not conferred lightly, in terms of actual and potential power the constable was among the most important officers in the realm. The position carried with it not merely formal obligations, but in the event of a crisis such as the King being killed in battle, or if his power was deemed to be tyrannical, the constable was empowered to take over the reins of government. Authorised to act summarily against those suspected of treason, the constable was able to pronounce sentence without appeal. This was not the first time however, that the duke had been selected for such an important office. He had been appointed high steward at the trial of the duke of Clarence in 1477, perhaps the most 'mysterious parliamentary trial of

4. J.A.F. Thomson, 'Bishop Lionel Woodville and Richard III', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LIX (1986), p. 131.

5. For the institution of the Prince's council, *C.P.R.*, 1467-77, p. 283. The appointment of Earl Rivers as governor of the Prince's council was sealed on 10 November, 1473; see Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 328, and Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, pp. 77-9, for details on duchy obligations.

6. J. G. Bellamy, *The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages* (1970), p. 160.

7. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*, p. 207.

the middle ages', in which Edward IV, in unprecedented fashion, verbally accused his brother of treason, and at which the twenty-three year old Henry formally pronounced sentence. For a short time Buckingham, as steward of England, was president of the court of parliament.⁸

It was not unreasonable to expect that Buckingham should receive such a prestigious office at an early age. For well over one hundred years, the Staffords had played a central role in the affairs of state. Humphrey Stafford, created a duke in 1444, had been, in a military and political context, at the centre of national politics since the third decade of the fifteenth century. He had tasted service in France by 1420 and had become a royal councillor in 1424. By 1432 he had held office as constable of France, governor of Paris and lieutenant-general of Normandy. Acquiring the captaincy of Belleme Castle and the title, count of Perche, he became constable of Calais in 1442, and, as noted, constable of England soon after. Politically, Buckingham had steered a middle course through the decades, serving the crown through the vicissitudes of government. And he continued to prosper, receiving the constablership of Dover in 1448 and the office of warden of the Cinque Ports in 1450.⁹ His military power made him a valuable asset to the crown and this was displayed on occasion. In February 1454 the duke mobilised support for Henry VI, to the tune of 2,000 liveried followers.¹⁰ Playing a decisive role in the duke of York's defeat at Ludford in 1459, Buckingham was able to mobilise the south-east coast, as warden of the Cinque Ports, against attack from supporters of York and the earl of Warwick.¹¹

His death at Northampton in 1460 had been preceded by the death of his eldest son, Humphrey, in 1457. Buckingham's grandson, Henry, became his heir at the age of five in 1460. He inherited his grandfather's lands in 1473 at the age of eighteen, and by this stage he had already acquired prominence at the court of Edward IV.¹² A member of the King's household since the age of nine, when his wardship was purchased by Edward on 28 February 1464, Henry was quickly betrothed to Elizabeth Woodville's younger sister Katherine, whom he married around May, 1465.¹³ Entering the Queen's household three months later, Buckingham had been

8. Bellamy, *op.cit.*, pp. 170-1; Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 136. The office had been held traditionally by the Bohuns whence it passed to Thomas of Woodstock duke of Gloucester (d. 1397), and through him to the Staffords.

9. Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, pp. 20-7; McFarlane, *op.cit.*

10. Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, p. 24.

11. 'Gregory's Chronicle', p. 207.

12. McFarlane, *op.cit.*

13. C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 298.

created a knight of the Bath at the Queen's coronation with his brother Humphrey, Viscount Lisle, and the new earl of Oxford.¹⁴ Very much a part of the festivities and formalities of courtly life, at the age of thirteen, in 1468, the young duke attended Lord Scales, who contested the Bastard of Burgundy in a grand tournament, along with the duke of Clarence, the earls of Arundel and Kent, and lords Herbert and Stafford.¹⁵ Attending most official banquets, he was present at the Christmas celebrations at Westminster Palace in 1471, where he sat on Edward's left, the bishop of Rochester on his right.¹⁶ He attended a banquet in honour of seigneur de la Gruthuyse, a Burgundian envoy, in 1473, where he danced with the Princess Elizabeth,¹⁷ and he was prominent at the duke of York's wedding in 1477. The following year he paid homage to the young duke, with Gloucester, Dorset and others, on the occasion of a feast for Prince Edward. This same year the King became godfather to his first son, Edward, giving a gold christening cup as a present.¹⁸

Prominent also in the period of crisis for Edward IV, 1469-71, Buckingham was among those who rode through London to greet the King back from York after his temporary captivity, with the dukes of Gloucester and Suffolk, the earls of Arundel, Northumberland and Essex, lords Hastings, Dacre, Mountjoy and an array of knights, esquires and London officials.¹⁹ After the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471, and the Bastard of Fauconberg's abortive rising in the South East, the duke was among Edward's entourage when he triumphantly entered London on Tuesday, 21 May, together with the dukes of Clarence and Gloucester, Norfolk and Suffolk.²⁰

Despite, however, the duke's role in the formalities of courtly life, and his attendance on the King during periods of political crisis, Buckingham was excluded from political office and activity in all but a superficial sense.²¹ All this was to change, however, in a few strokes in the spring and summer of 1483. As well as scooping a rash of offices, formerly the preserve of the Woodvilles, Buckingham had secured all the Bohun lands, his by right since 1473, and had obtained the most prestigious office of constable of England, for life. Incredibly, just three months later, the duke took arms against the King and joined the rebellion which ultimately led to Richard's downfall at Bosworth in August, 1485.

14. Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 375-8.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 417.

16. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 38.

17. *Ibid.*

18. B. L., Add Ms, 6113, f. 74; Scofield, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 297, n.2.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 503.

20. Scofield, *op.cit.*

21. For discussion on Edward's policies in regard to the duke, see above, Part 3, Chapter 8.

When the King left Buckingham at Gloucester towards the end of July, both reportedly in high spirits, the scenario which was to unfold would have seemed to Richard, the most unlikely set of events imaginable. Yet if Buckingham was the most unlikely candidate for disaffection, Richard was no stranger to intrigue from other quarters. Three weeks after his brother's death on 9 April, he arrested Rivers, Sir Richard Grey and Thomas Vaughan, three of the new King's most respected councillors, on a charge of plotting against Gloucester's honour and his life.²² Some weeks later, Gloucester, fearful of great unrest, directed a sum of money 'to be delivered to such persons as my lord protector and my lords of his counsel will send unto divers parties of this realm for the safeguard of the same'.²³ On 10 June, Gloucester in London, requested armed assistance from York against Elizabeth Woodville, whom he charged was plotting against his person 'and the old royal blood of this realm'.²⁴ As a corollary, on 13 June Hastings was executed and the bishop of Ely, John Morton, the archbishop of York, Thomas Rotherham, and Thomas, Lord Stanley were arrested and imprisoned on a charge of plotting treason with the Queen.²⁵ The second continuator wrote that during the King's journey northward after the coronation, a plot was discussed by the people of the southern counties to deliver the Princes from the Tower of London; further, that those in sanctuary proposed to deliver the Princesses from Westminster and send them to safety across the sea. This story is in part corroborated by Elizabethan antiquary John Stow who mentions a plot involving Edward's former servants and others to rescue the Princes by diverting attention from the Tower of London to fires in another part of the city.²⁶ Dominic Mancini, a foreign observer writing towards the end of 1483 reported a rumour that the Princes were widely believed dead in the capital by early July.²⁷ Without precise chronology, this rumour is substantiated in the near-contemporary sources: in the writing of the French historian Jean Molinet; in the work of the Warwickshire antiquarian, John Rous; in the relevant London chronicles, the 'Vitellius A XVI' and Robert Fabyan's *The Great Chronicle*; and in the early sixteenth century by Renaissance historian, Polydore Vergil.

22. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 157; Mancini, pp. 75-7; *Extant Documents*, p. 16.

23. Horrox, 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V', f. 18.

24. *Extracts from the Municipal Records of the City of York during the Reigns of Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III*, ed. R. Davies, p. 149.

25. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 159; Vergil, p. 180; *The Great Chronicle of London*, p. 231; Mancini, p. 91; see also Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 121-2; 'The Great Chronicle', Rous and Vergil mention Stanley's presence. The last two sources note that Stanley was wounded and arrested; the Chronicle states that he was 'immediately set at his liberty because Richard feared retaliation from his son, Lord Strange in Lancashire'.

26. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations* p. 163; *Annales*, p. 460, and see above Part 1, Chapter 2.

27. Mancini, p. 93.

As the discussion has demonstrated Richard had his own reasons for disquiet at this time. On learning of an enterprise towards the end of July, the King wrote to his chancellor on the 29th from Minster Lovell in Oxfordshire. Whatever its nature, the King 'doubts not' that Russell has heard of the affair, and surely cautions the chancellor to take matters in hand, 'fail ye not hereof'.²⁸ In early August, Margaret Beaufort's half-brother, John Welles organised a conspiracy at the Beaufort manor of Maxey in Northamptonshire. On discovery, his lands were forfeited and Welles joined Henry Tudor in Brittany.²⁹ Suspecting further trouble, Richard ordered 2000 Welsh bills from Nicholas Spicer on 17 August at Leicester, 'in all possible haste' and instituted commissions of oyer and terminer in various counties. In September, Richard, while unaware of his ally's defection, clearly suspected trouble in other quarters, and Peter Curtis and Robert Morton were dismissed from office. Curtis, and probably Morton fled to sanctuary. Interestingly, the following day Lionel Woodville, bishop of Salisbury, had his 'worldly' goods seized.³⁰ Most significantly, however, the records indicate that it was on this day that the duke of Buckingham finally became committed to the rebellion, and allegedly wrote to Henry Tudor informing him of the rising, asking him to participate.³¹

There is irony in the fact that the duke became part of what was originally the Woodville plot, which initially had aimed at least at curbing Gloucester's power. While some writers dispute such an intrigue, there is indeed strong evidence in support of a Woodville plot against Gloucester in April 1483 which embraced the lord chamberlain and others by early June.³² Even before Edward's death, Rivers was eager to determine the type of authority he could wield as governor of the Prince of Wales, as a letter to his business agent, Andrew Dymmock on 8 March, 1483, indicates.³³ After Edward's death the Woodvilles were indeed well-placed with control of the young Prince, and determined to show their strength. And their position did not go unnoticed. After a council meeting at the end of the month, Lord Hastings urged the Queen to limit the size of her retinue to accompany the Prince, in the care of his maternal relatives, from Ludlow to London, and wrote to Richard in Yorkshire, requesting that he 'hasten to the capital with a strong force'.³⁴ Mancini comments that Richard had found caches of arms emblazoned

28. P.R.O., C81/1392/1.

29. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 7.

30. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 23-4.

31. *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 245. See also appendices of documents in B.A. Pocquet du Haut-Jusse, *op.cit.*, and J. L. A. Calmette and G. Perinelle, *op.cit.*

32. See, for example, Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 112-15.

33. Ives, "Andrew Dymmock and the Papers of Anthony, Earl Rivers, 1482-3", p. 223.

34. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 155; Mancini, p. 73.

with Woodville badges which he later displayed as evidence against them, while according to the continuator, Richard knew of men 'close to the king' who had sworn to 'destroy' his 'honour and his life'.³⁵ Indeed Rivers had left the royal party at Stony Stratford ostensibly to welcome Gloucester at Northampton. However this could well have been a delaying tactic while his kinsmen stockpiled arms at their manor of Grafton Regis, which bisected the towns.³⁶ By late May or early June, Hastings had become involved in the Woodville conspiracy. Elizabeth (Jane) Shore, a former mistress of Edward, liaised with the Woodvilles and Hastings, while John Forster, servant of both Hastings and Elizabeth Woodville, and former steward of St Albans, also carried information between Dorset, in sanctuary there, and the lord chamberlain.³⁷ Gloucester was aware of this intrigue by June 10 as his letter to York requesting aid 'to assist us against the Queen...' indicates. The charge of treason against Hastings and his death along with the imprisonment of John Morton, bishop of Ely, Thomas Rotherham, Stanley and Forster, just three days later, suggests that a conspiracy was indeed alive in the Protector's mind.

And Richard was unable to shake his unease. Both 'The Great Chronicle' and Vergil report that Stanley, after spending a short time in the Tower was set free only because Richard feared repercussions from Lord Strange, Stanley's son, at large in Lancashire. Nor were others in high office trusted by the King. The cautionary note in Richard's order to bishop Russell, his chancellor, on 29 July, to 'take matters in hand', and the urgency with which he recalled from him the great seal some weeks later on 12 October indicate Richard's state of high tension and the perceived disaffection, at least, of his principal officials. Another whose loyalty was suspect, Buckingham's kinsman, Thomas Bourghier, archbishop of Canterbury, had earlier led the delegation, including Russell, to Westminster to persuade the Queen to relinquish the duke of York from sanctuary. However three weeks later he was absent from Richard's coronation.³⁸

35. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 157 ; Mancini, p. 77: Richard 'accused them of conspiring his death and of preparing ambushes both in the capital and on the road'.

36. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth*, p. 181, n.6.

37. *Wedgwood*, p. 346. Forster had transferred the stewardship of St Albans to Hastings in February, 1483. See also Hanham, *op.cit.*, pp. 25-6, for details on Forster and Lord Hastings.

38. B. P. Wolffe and C. Ross note that the extant contemporary evidence suggesting a Woodville-Hastings plot is slight and rests on Richard's own allegations: the letter dispatched North on 10/11 June requesting a northern muster to come to his aid; secondly Vergil and Sir Thomas More's account of Richard's charge of sorcery against the Queen and Shore, involving Hastings. However the evidence provided in the text, together with Gloucester's prompt action on June 13, substantiate the notion of a plot, at the very least in Richard's mind. For Lord Strange in Lancashire, at the time of

Yet throughout Richard's troubles Buckingham was at hand to display his great military strength as the most powerful subject in the land. He reportedly promised Gloucester 'a 1000 good fellows if need were', before Edward V left for London on 24 April 1483, although it seems that no more than 300 Stafford retainers accompanied the duke to Northampton where he met Gloucester, five days later.³⁹ Over the next few days however, his were among the armed retainers who flocked south 'in numero terribili et inaudito', during this time of great military activity. According to John Rous, the duke himself boasted that not since the time of Warwick the Kingmaker had so many men worn a single badge.⁴⁰ As well as military support, Buckingham put his organizational and oratorical skills to work on Gloucester's behalf. He supervised investigations into the activities of Thomas Rotherham, Morton and Hastings. He approved and encouraged Richard's claim to the throne, and in seductive tones put forward the notion that Edward IV and his sons were illegitimate, which was 'so well and eloquently uttered and with so angelic a countenance...' Flying high with the constableness recently conferred on him, according to Edward Hall he made a splendid progress through London at the head of a large entourage. As the great chamberlain, Buckingham played a central role at Richard's coronation. He helped the King to dress at various times before and during the ceremony, was responsible for the offerings made by Richard during the service, and bore the King's train, carrying 'a white staff in his hand'.⁴¹ Yet it was only a matter of weeks later that the duke became involved in a second but inter-connected plot which aimed, as noted, at replacing Richard III with Henry Tudor.

Edward Hall suggests that a chance meeting took place between Margaret Beaufort and Buckingham, soon after he left the King at Gloucester, and that he was informed of a Woodville-Beaufort plot involving a match between Henry Tudor and Elizabeth of York, the facts of which were perfectly well known 'at large', indeed perhaps devised by Buckingham's prisoner at Brecon, John Morton.⁴² It is worth speculating that such a meeting took place between Buckingham and Lady Margaret. Kin by marriage, the duke had negotiated on her

'Buckingham's rebellion' see 'Plumpton Correspondence', *op.cit.*, pp. 43-4; for Bourghier, C.H. Clough, 'The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents', a review article in *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 85 (1984), pp. 384-9; see also Wolffe, 'When and Why did Hastings lose his Head?', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXIX (1974), p. 842; Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 80-4, esp. p. 81.

39. *The Chronicle of John Hardyng*, ed. H. Ellis (1812), p. 475.

40. Hanham, *op.cit.*, p. 122. However his force was 'greatly inferior in numbers' according to Rous.

41. Hall, *The Union of the two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre & York*, p. 375; B.L. Add Ms 6113, f. 22; see also *Extant Documents*, pp. 246-7.

42. See above, Chapter 2; see also Griffiths and Thomas, *The Making of the Tudor Dynasty*, pp. 88, 90-1.

behalf with Richard for Henry Tudor's return from exile and marriage with a princess of York. A match, most probably with Princess Elizabeth, had been a topic of discussion since the early 1470s, and in a more serious context during Edward IV's last years. In view of the cordial relations Lady Margaret shared with Edward throughout his reign, such a match could have held appeal for the late King as well.⁴³ After his death it was again on the agenda, and in June and early July Lady Margaret had engaged the duke's services in this capacity.⁴⁴ Fully aware of the plan before he reached Brecon, it was here that Buckingham held further discussions with Morton who cogently argued in favour of a match between Henry Tudor and the Yorkist Princess.⁴⁵

The duke presumably reached Brecon early in August. He was certainly at his principal Welsh seat by 23 August where an order passed under his signet to the keeper of the park at Chilton Foliat, to deliver a buck to a John Isbury.⁴⁶ Meanwhile, Richard who was at York by August 29, or 30, was enjoying signs of loyalty in the North despite the recent unrest. Quite unaware of Buckingham's intrigue, for the duke had led the commissions of oyer and terminer in London and the Home Counties in early September, as late as 16 September the King had issued writs to the receivers in north and south Wales, directing them to pay their accounts to the duke of Buckingham.⁴⁷ Towards the end of September, however, the King learned of an intrigue involving Bishop Lionel Woodville and most likely John Morton's nephew, Robert, and Peter Curtis. The bishop was at this time involved in diocesan business, and the register of Woodville's successor to the bishopric of Salisbury, Thomas Langton, notes the lengthy dealings concerning the appropriation of the chapel of St Katherine in the church of Wanborough, Wiltshire, to Magdalen College. On 22 September, Woodville issued letters to the abbot of Hyde, who was conducting the appropriation. Of great interest is their place of issue, "'in domo habitacionis nostre in Thornbury Wigorn' dioc'". In fact Woodville was in Gloucestershire at Buckingham's principal seat.⁴⁸ The evidence, or lack of it concerning Woodville's whereabouts

43. Jones and Underwood, *op.cit.*, pp. 60-1.

44. *Ibid*; Griffiths and Thomas, *op.cit.*, p. 88. In a testimony given by Thomas, earl of Derby regarding the consanguinity of Henry VII Derby states that he had heard Richard, earl of Salisbury, and Margaret Beaufort discuss the kinship of Henry Tudor and Elizabeth, and their wish for a dispensation: *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, p. 18.

45. Holinshed, *op.cit.*, pp. 411-2; *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, p. 17; Griffiths and Thomas, *op.cit.*, p. 91; Jones and Underwood, *op.cit.*, pp. 61-2.

46. P.R.O., SC1/44/75.

47. C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 465; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 4.

48. Thomson, 'Bishop Lionel Woodville and Richard III', p. 133.

in all the contemporary records, suggests that he was at Thornbury on a voluntary basis. And as J.A.F. Thomson suggests, in view of the earlier animosity between Buckingham and the Woodvilles, the bishop's whereabouts at this time indicates that he was involved in intrigue with the duke. Furthermore, in view of this information it seems scarcely coincidental that the duke allegedly sent a letter the next day to Henry Tudor. According to the 'second continuator' and Vergil, Richard began to suspect Buckingham's involvement at this time, and kept him under close surveillance. It is unlikely, however, that the King became aware of the duke's defection until the second week of October, evidenced by his profound shock in his letter to Bishop Russell on 12 October.⁴⁹ Richard, aware of Morton at Brecon, probably in league with others in different parts of the Stafford estates, and the proximity of Woodville, doubtless decided to act. For his part, the duke, aware of the seizure of Woodville's temporalities and the dismissal of Robert Morton and Curtis, felt the noose tightening, and wrote to Henry Tudor.⁵⁰

The Stafford manor of Thornbury was geographically well-placed as a conspiratorial centre between London and Brecon, close to both the Severn and Bristol. It was also conveniently situated for communication with the other centres of rebellion.⁵¹ Importantly, if as Hall suggests, Beaufort was at her Stafford manor of Bridgnorth in Shropshire, then the conspirators were indeed well-placed to send and receive information around various parts of the Stafford

49. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 163; Vergil, pp. 198-9; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 152.

50. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 163. It is worth noting that the Mortons had held land in Buckingham's lordship of Thornbury and elsewhere in the county since at least the 1420s. A deed of 1429 testifies to a grant by a William Seynt of Thornbury to John Morton, clerk, of a void piece of land in the high street of Thornbury: *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, A6421. While the bishop of Ely's forbears were principally from Dorset, A.E. Fuller states that Sir Robert Morton was 'brother to the Bishop of Worcester (Robert Morton, clerk of the rolls) and nephew of Cardinal Morton'. G. Waters suggests that Sir Robert was the son of Thomas Morton and Dorothy his wife, heiress of John Twynyho, a lawyer of Cirencester and a retainer of the duke of Buckingham, and that through his mother Sir Robert had inherited his principal lands in Gloucestershire, see G. Waters, 'Morton connections in Gloucestershire', *op.cit.*, pp. 17-8. In view of the whereabouts of John Morton at Brecon, Woodville at Thornbury and the dismissal of Sir Robert's brother in September, it is probable that the latter, created archdeacon of Gloucester in 1482, was also at Thornbury at this time. In addition, Morton was well-placed to gain information in London, for Waters also talks of his office as master of the rolls, as being a 'tower within a Tower': see also A. E. Fuller, 'Cirencester Documents', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society*, Vol. XX (1895-6), p. 124.

51. See above, Part 2, for more detail on the strategic importance of both Brecon and Thornbury.

estates, before disseminating it on the wider circuit. The areas were, by this stage, clearly delineated and it seems likely that the Woodville plot of April could well have laid the organisational pattern for the autumn risings. Certainly in the South West, as demonstrated, the Woodvilles were well-placed in terms of a solid power-base which they had been cultivating since the 1470s. And their contacts spread throughout the Central South and South Eastern counties.⁵² The Woodvilles' downfall did not interrupt the flow of patronage to these men. In fact many of the leading rebels received their best rewards after Edward's death - from Richard himself, and through the good offices of powers such as Norfolk, Surrey, Viscount Lovell and the duke of Buckingham.

If Buckingham was able to dispense court patronage, formerly the preserve of the Woodvilles, from May 1483, he was certainly well-acquainted with almost all of Edward's leading knights and esquires. As a young boy the duke was associated with both the King and Queen, having been placed in their households. Familiar with Edward's prominent servants - St Leger, Fogge, Guildford, Norris and Brown, their paths had crossed often in daily affairs and also through the formalities and festivities of courtly life in which the nobility and gentry were active participants.

Many of the rebels had already received Stafford patronage through the decades. Although writers justifiably comment that few had any known 'political' connections with the duke, by 1483 layers of activity linked the leading gentry with the family. With lands scattered throughout the South, the Staffords had employed numerous knights and esquires in estate-management, as senior household staff, legal advisors, bureaucrats and councillors.⁵³ In the West the Lanherne Arundels, Hodys, Willoughbys, Berkeleys, Poyntzs, Latimers, Trevelyans, Darells and Twynyhos, and in the Central South and East, the Harcourts, Knyvets, Pympe, St Legers, Scotts, Cheyneys, Guildfords and Gaynesfords, were, or had served the

52. See above, Part 2, Chapter 3 and below, Part 3, Chapter 8, for the types of patronage dispensed by the Woodvilles, and the recipients.

53. Rawcliffe notes that few of the rebels were connected with Buckingham: Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, p. 33; R. Horrox in her Ph. D. thesis, *op.cit.*, comments that the only supporters of Buckingham who rebelled were those too closely identified with him to avoid commitment, and that in fact the duke's contribution to the rebellion was 'slight'. In her 1989 study, this view is maintained to a large degree, and Buckingham remains 'peripheral in a geographical as well as a political sense'. Ross also feels that Buckingham was connected with few of the insurgents. See Horrox, 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', p. 56; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 164; Ross, *Richard III*, p. 105.

family in various capacities on their estates.⁵⁴ In addition there were scores of other annuitants, neither members of the household nor in the main long-term estate employees who had received Stafford patronage. Richard Culpepper esquire, on the muster roll for Humphrey's visit to Calais in 1447, was awarded £5 per annum in 1440, from the first duke's lordship of Tonbridge. His nephew, Alexander, rose in rebellion in Kent.⁵⁵ Thomas de la Mare received £5 in 1452 from Westcombe, Somerset in return 'for past and present services'. His son, rebel, Sir Thomas of Aldermaston, Berkshire, acted with William Norris, another Newbury rebel, on Buckingham's behalf in 1482.⁵⁶ Thomas Uvedale, whose son Thomas was listed as a traitor in 1484, was retained by the Staffords from 1452 until 1460. After his death his wife, Elizabeth, maintained close ties with Henry, whom she named a trustee for her lands held of leading South East rebel, Sir John Guildford.⁵⁷ Many others were linked with the duke through their work as trustees (for powerful friends) and for the crown on important commissions in the regions (such as the subsidy commissions of April and August 1483) including Richard Haute and John Fogge, Richard Guildford, William Scott, St Leger and the Lewkenors.⁵⁸

While the positions on Stafford estates were not political appointments, the employees were yet well-placed through their connections to receive choice offices in county administration. For example Nicholas Gaynesford was elected for the Surrey borough of Bletchingly in 1453 and 1467, in the gift of the dukes of Buckingham.⁵⁹ Another Stafford retainer, Reginald Hassall, was a customer of Poole for the crown by May 1483, along with John Kymer and John Flasby. All three were listed as Buckingham's men in May 1483.⁶⁰ In view of the rewards granted by Henry VII to Hassall, for 'good and trusty service...and especially at our victorious journey for the recovering of this our most noble realm', Hassall could well have been the agent sent to meet Henry Tudor at Poole in October. He received the office of which Richard had deprived him, bailiff of the lordship of Oakham, Rutland.⁶¹ Kymer, who received a pardon for offences in February, 1484, was also implicated in rebellion, and some weeks after his pardon, absconded from his post with 'certain duties amounting to a great sum of

54. See above, Part 2, Chapter 3.

55. Rawcliffe, *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521*, pp. 75, 233.

56. C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 979; see also *Ancient Deeds*, Vol. 1, no. 623 for the activity of Delamare, Bray and William Norris on behalf of Buckingham's uncle.

57. C.I.P.M., no. 400.

58. See above, Part 2, Chapters 3, and 4, and Part 3, Chapter 9.

59. *Wedgwood*, p. 368.

60. Horrox, 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V', f. 15v.

61. *Materials*, Vol. 1, pp. 202, 285.

money unto us belonging by reason of our customs there'. Interestingly John Morton's brother, Richard, was, as controller of Poole in 1483 an associate of Hassall, Flasby and Kymer, and, with his kinsmen was listed as a traitor in Dorset.⁶²

Through the agency of Buckingham and others, 1483 was a most profitable year for many knights and esquires. Yet these were the men who rebelled against Richard III. Some such as Courtenay and Arundel, refusing even after the abortive Exeter revolt to recant, raised their standard at Bodmin in early November and having galvanized most of the county, 'incited them to murder, slay and utterly overthrow the King himself, and...set up another King in his place'.⁶³

It is worth exploring a little more fully the nature of the power and the type of support which Buckingham's new position brought. The duke had considerable patronage at his disposal. His offices accorded him great control in Wales and the South West, while his influence also extended into the South East. With the death of Hastings in June, he was in a position to take command of the household party, as mediator and regulator of patronage. He was also well-placed to take command of the lord chamberlain's power-base in the Midlands. There is little evidence that Hastings had controlled the flow of patronage to the West Country knights in the 1470s and early 1480s. There were others here whose influence was much stronger. With the death in 1469 of Humphrey Stafford, briefly earl of Devon, lords Dinham and Fitzwarin and importantly Clarence, were supreme.⁶⁴ After Clarence's execution it was the Woodvilles and Greys, who, together with Edward's brother-in-law, Sir Thomas St Leger, who was granted many of Clarence's south-west estates, gained an iron grip in the region. Hastings, regional leader of the Midlands, seems to have exerted little influence in any of the southern

62. B.L.H.M., Vol. 2, p. 85; significantly John Kymer and John Cheyney, who probably collaborated after the rising were rewarded by Henry VII in the same grant in 1485; see above Part 2, Chapter 5, for details on Kymer. For Morton, see Horrox, 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V', p. 227.

63. Royal Institution of Cornwall, BV. 1/4. This document (as noted) relates to an inquisition taken at Bodmin on 3 December, 1483. It may be significant that an inventory taken at St Peter's Cathedral on 6 September 1506 revealed standards of both the duke of Buckingham and the earl of Devon; see G. Oliver, *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter and A History of the Cathedral* (Exeter, 1861), p. 328.

64. See Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence*, Appendix IV.

counties despite his duchy position and prominence in the household.⁶⁵ However with the eclipse of the Woodvilles and the death of the lord chamberlain, it was Buckingham to whom the regional power-brokers would have looked, and it was Buckingham who, if time had allowed would have become patron of the household men. As well as vast control in the South and Wales, doubtless the Midlands would also have fallen into his hands. Indeed Simon Stallworth's letter to Sir William Stonor soon after Hastings' death, with its ambiguous comment, 'my lord chamberlain's men become my lord of Buckingham's men...' could allude to the duke's probable patronage of the household party. More likely, however, it refers to Buckingham's proposed takeover of Hastings's retinue in the Midlands. If in fact Buckingham had been granted the wardship of Hastings's son, which went to his widow Katherine, and had been able to galvanize the Midlands, almost certainly victory for the rebels would have been assured.⁶⁶

It is difficult to reconcile the position Buckingham attained in the affairs of national politics through the summer of 1483, the actual and potential power made available to him through his contribution to Richard's usurpation, with his defection and downfall in October. The intrigue which began in April with the Woodvilles, was fed initially by a desire to curb Gloucester's power. Later it aimed to reinstate Edward V, and had embraced Lord Hastings, Morton, Thomas Rotherham, Lord Stanley and other courtiers by June. Still later, a second, inter-connected plot sought to overthrow Richard III and place Henry Tudor on the throne, joining the houses of Lancaster and York through a match between the new King and Princess Elizabeth. Involved in the first plot, the Woodvilles, Morton and the other conspirators were joined some weeks later by Margaret Beaufort and the duke of Buckingham. As P.M. Kendall states, 'it is with the entry of Buckingham that the scene grows murky'. The motives of the other conspirators may be fairly easy to unravel. The rationale behind the duke's rebellion, in view of all he had gained - and all he stood to lose - is far more difficult to untangle.

While stressing Buckingham's leadership of the rising, the principal contemporary sources of information are infuriatingly curt on the matter. The Act of Attainder passed by Richard's parliament simply lists the rebels and their areas of activity. The second continuator comments that concern over the fate of the Princes through the summer of 1483 led the people of the southern and western parts of the kingdom 'to form assemblies'; later when they 'began considering vengeance, public proclamation...[was] made that Henry, duke of

⁶⁵. While Houghton, *op.cit.*, suggests that Hastings's influence secured seats for Thomas Kebell, a Leicestershire lawyer, and Thomas Powell, a Derbyshire lawyer through his duchy position, there is no direct evidence that he dispensed this type of patronage to West Country household men.

⁶⁶. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 4-5.

Buckingham...would be captain-in-chief in this affair'.⁶⁷ Rather tersely 'Vitellius AXVI' notes the gravitation of the men of Kent and other regions to the duke of Buckingham. 'The Great Chronicle', stressing the number and power of the gentry rebels, notes their flight on learning of Buckingham's failure to gather his followers. In marked contrast Polydore Vergil explores the rising in more detail, yet his account differs from the other sources, particularly the second continuator, in tone as well as detail.⁶⁸

In view of his extraordinary about-face from Richard, it is worthwhile speculating on the duke's part in the crime which alienated political society in the South and drove them to rebellion against the King, an act which, if successful, would also have meant Buckingham's destruction. Many historians have speculated on the duke's part in the death of the Princes. Writing in 1878, J. Gairdner comments that 'if we may rely on the reported conversations of Buckingham with Bishop Morton, the duke must have been very well aware...' of the boys' murder. Noting Buckingham's alleged request to Henry Tudor on 24 September to participate in rebellion, Buckingham must have been apprised, 'while as yet it was a secret to the world at large'.⁶⁹ Fifty years on, Kendall writes that the duke, very much the pawn of Morton and Reginald Bray in their scheme, was 'able to give the Bishop assurances that they [the Princes] were out of the way...'.⁷⁰ There is, in fact, primary evidence which suggests Buckingham's guilt. The duke is clearly implicated in a London chronicle, recently discovered, as the man by whose 'advice' the boys were murdered; the charge is also alluded to in the Ashmolean Manuscripts.⁷¹ This was obviously an opinion held at the time, for Molinet, discounting his direct involvement, states that on the day on which the Princes were murdered 'the duke of Buckingham arrived at the Tower of London', but was 'wrongly believed to have...killed the said children because he pretended to have right to the crown'. Both Commynes and *The Divisie Chronicle* also mention the duke in this context, but like Molinet, dismiss the rumour as having little credence.⁷² If indeed Kendall's supposition that Buckingham had enthroned a

67. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 163.

68. See above, Part 1, Chapter 1, for a discussion on similarities and contrasts between the sources, and the rationale for such.

69. Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 133.

70. Kendall, *op.cit.*, p. 267.

71. Green, 'Historical notes of a London citizen, 1483-1488', p. 588; see also J.A.F. Thomson 'The Death of Edward V: Dr Richmond's Dating Reconsidered', *Northern History*, Vol. XXVI (1990), p. 210; for the Ashmolean Manuscripts, A. J. Pollard, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower*, p. 123.

72. Molinet, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 431. Philippe de Commynes asserts that Buckingham was the man 'who had put the two children to death', but this after his comment that 'the duke [Gloucester] had his two

King 'only to pluck him from the throne and seize his crown' were plausible then credence could be given to his direct responsibility for their murder. However there is a flaw in this argument. It is improbable that the premier noble, reputedly the most powerful man in the kingdom would have wasted his talents on crowning Richard in order to dethrone him only weeks later. With his double descent from Edward III through his Beaufort mother from John of Gaunt, and also as the unchallenged heir of Thomas of Woodstock, Edward's youngest son, why wait for Richard's coronation to depose him? Yet again, it seems improbable that, if intent on the crown for himself, he would have succumbed to Morton's argument that Henry Tudor had the better claim, and as Kendall suggests, that he would have led the rebellion against the King, shelving, for the time-being his own aspirations.⁷³

It seems unlikely, as C. Ross comments, that any subject of the realm, 'however powerful and eminent, would take the initiative and the responsibility in murdering a deposed king'.⁷⁴ And, as Ross plausibly argues, there is an overwhelming weight of evidence in the contemporary and later sources, in both the English and foreign accounts, which suggests Richard III as the man directly responsible for the boys' murder. The two most pertinent questions - who stood to gain most from the boys' death? who had the power to cover-up the crime? - do little to absolve Richard of guilt in the affair. There is, however, the matter of the ambiguous letter of 29 July sent by Richard to Russell in London, concerning 'certain persons' who 'of late had taken upon them the fact of an enterprise'. In view of the evidence in contemporary reports that the boys were dead by mid to late July, it is difficult not to associate this letter with that crime. Taking into account Buckingham's role in Richard's usurpation and the influence he had over the King, it is indeed possible that Buckingham effected a plan which he had discussed with Richard before they both left London. It could be that Buckingham was acting with Richard's knowledge and consent, or that he took rather too much upon himself and brought about a result which, until then, had simply been talked about. In either event it is likely that Buckingham played a prominent role in the murders - in encouraging and abetting the crime. In view of Richard's comments in October against 'he who had best cause to be true', such a scenario seems entirely plausible.

It is in this context that the duke's defection can best be explained. Before he left London for Brecon at the end of July, he would have been aware of the growing hostility in many quarters against the King over his usurpation and the disappearance of the Princes. Frightened by the

nephews murdered': Commynes, *op.cit.*, pp.354, 396. For the Ashmolean Manuscripts and the Divisie Chronicle, see Pollard, *op.cit.*; see also above, Part 1, Chapter 2.

⁷³. Kendall, *op.cit.*, pp. 266-7.

⁷⁴. Ross, *Richard III*, p. 104.

reaction to these occurrences and aware both of his own complicity and Richard's ebbing political power, Buckingham at Brecon was made aware by Morton of the full momentum of the scheme to overthrow Richard, which, doubtless he felt would succeed and which would surely undermine his own position as the King's closest ally, if he did not defect. Over the next few weeks he decided to take leadership of the rebellion and at the same time embarked on a campaign to denigrate the King in an attempt to cover his own tracks and lend authenticity to his about-face. Indeed the Crowland Chronicler mentions in the same breath the public proclamation asserting Buckingham's leadership in the enterprise while, at the same time 'a rumour arose that King Edward's sons...had met their fate'.⁷⁵ To this effect it is quite possible that he used his office as constable of England with its attendant powers both to 'legitimate' his action and to 'whip up' sentiment against a King widely believed to have killed his nephews and whose power was viewed by many as tyrannical. Fully committed to the plan by September, Buckingham had 'so many men' at Brecon on 18 October that he was able 'to go where he will'.⁷⁶ In point of fact Buckingham was unable to effectively organise sufficient support in Wales and those forces he had assembled were quickly scattered by a dramatic storm. The guerilla-like tactics employed by Humphrey Stafford of Grafton, preventing him from crossing the Severn, and the plunder of Brecon Castle by Sir Thomas Vaughan compounded his problems. Just ten days after the campaign began, the hapless duke having been betrayed by his childhood servant, Ralph Bannaster, was handed over to the sheriff of Shropshire. Richard's retribution was swift. Escorted to Salisbury by Sir James Tyrell and Giles Wellesbourne, Buckingham was summarily executed on Sunday 2 November, having been denied an audience with the King.⁷⁷

As Richard journeyed to Exeter preoccupied with thoughts of securing Henry Tudor, no doubt his mind returned to Buckingham 'who *had* best cause to be true', now referred to as 'the most untrue creature living'.⁷⁸ Clearly shocked at the duke's defection, the King would have pondered the unprecedented favours he had lavished on Buckingham to secure the latter's support during his bid for power; favours which had enabled him to take the limelight in national politics. Notwithstanding the duke's defection, Richard, not yet fully informed of the extent of the opposition to his rule in the South (in view of the relative ease with which he crushed the rebellion) would have become quickly aware of the brittle nature of his power, and

75. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 163.

76. *Plumpton Correspondence*, p. 45.

77. *The Great Chronicle of London*, pp. 234-5; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations* p. 165; Vergil, pp. 198-9.

78. P.R.O., C81/1301/6.

over the following months doubtless spent much time reflecting on his partnership with the duke For 'Buckingham's rebellion' heralded the start of his troubles.

CHAPTER 14

THE AFTERMATH

In an analysis of the revolt and its aftermath two features are striking: the degree to which Buckingham's own defection was - in the long term - the least of Richard's worries; and its corollary, the independent action of the gentry, whose revolt the duke had clearly joined. C. Ross has justifiably called the title, 'the Duke of Buckingham's Rebellion', 'singularly misleading'. Although the term itself seems not to have been coined until the late-nineteenth century, for the early Tudor historians the involvement of a leading nobleman set its stamp on the rising, which, because of this, and the concerns of the traditionalists, was viewed axiomatically as 'his'.¹ This was the pattern until the mid-nineteenth century when in response to a more careful reading of the primary material, the introduction of new sources and a more sober attitude to scholarship in general, the gentry were gradually accorded some status in the revolt. These changes are pronounced in Gairdner's work, which, in addition, set new parameters for the rebellion through less emphasis on 'personality', and a strong focus on more broadly-based concerns and sustained political analysis. It was Ross, however, who most forcefully stressed the independent action of the gentry and the incidental nature of Buckingham to the rising; not so much as Ross says because the duke had few 'known' connections with the gentry. In fact, as the discussion has shown, leading 'service' gentry had associated with the Staffords in all but a purely political context, for generations. Assuredly after Edward's death and the Woodvilles' fall, the duke was well-placed to convert these ties into political ones. And not uppermost because his revolt was an afterthought, when, in fact, plans had already been made; but most especially in view of what is known of the gentry themselves: their generations of wealth and power in the regions, their status at court; their tradition of service to the crown and their activity and allegiance throughout the period. Ross stresses the common thread of household service among the 1483 rebels. This was a feature in 1461 when the household had supported the new King, and more markedly ten years later, when the same men resisted Warwick. When the household, strengthened during Edward's second reign, and including those dissidents who, at times had assisted the rebels, rose against Richard III, Buckingham's own rebellion was the least of their concerns; and their continued disaffection attests to this.

In view of the high proportion of household men from the South East it is little surprising that in the weeks after the revolt trouble here required constant attention from Lord Cobham,

¹. Gairdner writes of the revolt under the title, 'Buckingham's Rebellion': Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 133; Kendall uses the phrase 'Buckingham's revolt': Kendall, *op.cit.*, p. 273.

while orders were issued to Canterbury against retainers and the wearing of liveries.² In January 1484 insurrection broke out in Kent, involving tenants of John and Richard Guildford, John Fogge and John Darrell, with others from Buckingham's own estates of Tonbridge and Penshurst.³ Tenants in many other areas were ordered to assist in the collection of issues 'not failing hereof as you 'will eschew our grievous displeasure at your peril'.⁴ Yet most of the unrest was centered in the South West through the spring and summer of 1484. Aware of the close contact between West Country merchants and the exiles, in March the King ordered the earl of Arundel's son John, and Lord Scrope to patrol the Channel.⁵ This had only limited success and attempts were made to frustrate Richard's negotiations with Brittany and France over Henry Tudor's surrender. Richard's envoys needed a letter of safe conduct 'to leave the realm...without interference', while Bretons needed a letter of passage assuring them of safe conduct at Dover or Sandwich. As a counter-measure Arundel was to ensure that all who took to sea pledged their loyalty to Richard III.⁶

On 6 July James Newenham, recently pardoned, was tried with others for treason before Lord Scrope.⁷ Still in July, Richard Edgecombe and Robert Willoughby were the subject of a more powerful commission of oyer and terminer again led by Scrope. Allegedly Edgecombe and West Country merchants, John Lenne of Launceston, John Belbury of Liskeard and John Toser of Exiland planned to send money to Edgecombe's neighbour, Willoughby, and Peter Courtenay, bishop of Exeter, both in exile. The sum involved was £52 apparently intended to ease the rebels' plight abroad and Belbury and Toser were subsequently pardoned. Edgecombe and Lenne, however, were indicted, the former escaping to Brittany having forfeited his lands and goods.⁸

Far more serious was the treason of two Wiltshire esquires, William Collingbourne and John Turberville, kinsman of John Morton. Collingbourne met with others on 10 July in Portsoken ward, London, and arranged to send Thomas Yate to Brittany to entice Henry Tudor to invade England by way of Poole on St Luke's day, 18 October 1484. On 18 July Collingbourne secured seditious verse to the doors of St Paul's in a brazen display of opposition to Richard's rule. The

2. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 69.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 75, 81.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

5. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 277.

6. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 169, 178, 183; *H.M.C.*, 2nd report, p. 91; Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 196-9; Horrox, *op.cit.*

7. P.R.O., C81/1392/14; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 492-3.

8. P.R.O., C81/1392/17; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 456, 492; Holinshed, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 421; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 245; *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, pp. 180-1; Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 275-6.

commission into Collingbourne's intrigue was issued on 29 November, by which time it was clear that Henry Tudor either had not received news of, or acted upon the plan.⁹ It is significant, however, that 18 October 1484 was the proposed date of invasion, and lends credence to 18 October 1483, as the acknowledged date of the 1483 risings, and, therefore of great symbolic significance. Shaken, the King made an example of Collingbourne in October, and he was hanged, castrated and disembowelled in an effort to counter the disaffection which undermined royal authority. Yet the sedition continued and only weeks before Collingbourne's death Thomas Grayson was ordered to arrest West Country men who had acted 'against their natural duty and liegiance', while Robert Holand was assisted on 4 October in the arrest of unnamed rebels.¹⁰

Worse was to come, this time from East Anglia in the form of intrigue which spanned the Channel, involving Hammes, one of the Calais forts. This treason, led by prominent 1483 rebels and key men in Richard's own household, worried the King into an attempt to befriend the rebels.¹¹ Patently, it told Richard that the disaffection which had seeped into Westminster was widespread, and that gentry throughout the South were in close contact with the rebels in exile.

On 2 November Sir William Brandon and his sons led an armed revolt at Colchester, Essex, involving leading knight Sir William Stonor, along with Thomas Nandyke, all of whom had rebelled in 1483, and, in addition, Robert Clifford and significantly John Risley, esquire of the body to Richard. The conspiracy which involved Henry Tudor and the earl of Oxford, failed, and Brandon's sons Robert and William, with Risley and Stonor seized a ship and sailed from East Mersea to Henry Tudor, while Sir William returned to sanctuary at Colchester. Several days earlier on 28 October, Richard had ordered the return of John de Vere, earl of Oxford, imprisoned at Hammes, one of the Calais forts, since 1473. Rather than comply, Sir James Blount, captain of Hammes, Oxford and John Fortescue, gentleman porter of Calais joined Henry Tudor's court in the Ile-de-France. The Hammes garrison, without Blount, stood firm in the face of attack from the commander of Calais, John, Lord Dinham, in December. In the following January, Thomas Brandon, with Oxford, managed to enter the castle with a force and successfully negotiate a settlement for the garrison of around seventy-three men, who also

9. P.R.O., C81/1531/58; C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 519-20; Holinshed, *op.cit.*, pp. 422-3; Bellamy, *op.cit.*, Appendix III, pp. 237-8 for Collingbourne's indictment; Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 187; Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 276-7.

10. B.L.H.M., Vol. 2, pp. 164-5; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 277.

11. Gairdner, *op.cit.*, pp. 199-200; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 280.

joined Henry in the Ile-de-France.¹² Fearing an invasion by way of Harwich, Richard warned its citizens to be on guard, while Surrey, Middlesex and Hertfordshire were also warned to resist the rebels - with half a day's notice - should they arrive.¹³

The two episodes are clearly linked. According to the indictment the Brandons were assisting Oxford and Henry Tudor, and, as noted Thomas Brandon gained entry at Hammes with the earl in January 1485. John Risley was an associate of John Fortescue, whose seat, Ponsbourne was in a disaffected area of Hertfordshire.¹⁴ Significantly many of Oxford's de Vere estates, then held by John Howard, duke of Norfolk, were in Essex, and as R. Horrox suggests perhaps the Brandons hoped to raise local support in the area. Certainly Risley had been employed on the de Vere manor of Lavenham, while smaller fish such as John Starling and Thomas Taillour had also been de Vere annuitants.¹⁵ Other connections can be traced such as Stonor who was a merchant of the Staple of Calais.¹⁶

Most probably orchestrating the unrest was John Morton, bishop of Ely. He certainly had strong ties with most of the rebels including Brandon and Fortescue who had attended his induction feast. Morton was in contact with government circles in England and with the exiles in Brittany. It was through Morton that Henry Tudor learned of Richard's agreement with Pierre Landais, 'treasurer and effectively chief minister of Brittany', and fled to France. It is likely as C.S.L. Davies suggests that Morton was able to keep in touch with his diocese in East Anglia and the Calais garrison and direct a conspiracy from his residence in the Netherlands.¹⁷

From November, 1484, Richard, aware of the ramifications of the unrest, made a concerted and uncharacteristic attempt at conciliating his opposition through a number of steps. He offered a pardon to James Blount on 16 November, which was followed by confirmation of Blount's patronage under Edward. Some two weeks later Morton received an unsolicited pardon, while his servant, William Timperley became receiver-general of the Ely estates.¹⁸ On 27 January 1485, Thomas Brandon, Elizabeth Blount and the Hammes garrison were also pardoned,

12. *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, pp. 291-2; *Vergil*, pp. 208-9, 212-3; Virgoe, 'Sir John Risley 1443-1512: Courtier and Councillor', p. 143; Ross, *Richard III*, p. 108; A. Hanham, *The Celys and their World* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 197; Davies, *op.cit.*, pp. 6-7; Horrox, *op.cit.*, pp. 279-282.

13. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, pp. 182-3; Horrox, *op.cit.*, p. 278.

14. Davies, *op.cit.*, p. 7; Horrox, *op.cit.*, p. 280.

15. Virgoe, 'Sir John Risley 1443-1512: Courtier and Councillor', p. 142.

16. *Wedgwood*, pp. 815-6.

17. Davies, *op.cit.*, pp. 6-8.

18. *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 2, p. 183; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 535; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 281.

while the King tried to win over other 1483 rebels including Amyas Paulet, Sir Richard Woodville, his kinsman Reginald Pympe, John Fogge, Roger Tocotes, William Uvedale, Richard Haute and Michael Skilling. Covert activity including Sir James Tyrell's trip to Flanders at this time (presumably to treat with Morton), Richard's apparent success with Elizabeth Woodville who was allegedly responsible for the marquis of Dorset's attempt to quit France and return to England, the promotion of Elizabeth of York at court at Christmas 1484, and the flow of pardons, provide clear evidence of the King's policy to appease the rebels and win over the Woodvilles. It also reflects his grave concern.¹⁹

Yet Richard was unable to halt the disaffection, and as a portent, from October 1484 leading rebels of 1483 who had 'gone to ground' now joined Henry Tudor, including Berkeley, William and Thomas Brandon (the former pardoned in March, 1484) and Stonor. More worrying still was the defection of his own household esquires: John Risley, John Fortescue, Sir James Blount and possibly William Benstead.²⁰ In addition, it was around this time that Robert Clifford's brother, Sir Roger, one of Richard's Yorkshire associates and a yeoman of the crown under him, was captured and executed at Southampton.²¹ Esquire of the body John Mortimer was dismissed in February, 1485 as steward of duchy of Lancaster lands in Gloucestershire; John Sturgeon, steward of the royal manor of Ware lost his peace commission in Hertfordshire and his stewardship to Robert Brackenbury;²² Peter Curtis, a conspirator from 1483 who regained his post as keeper of the great wardrobe, was dismissed by mid-May and in sanctuary at Westminster, while Robert Morton, his co-conspirator was described at this time as 'king's rebel'.²³

Clearly the Essex plot, like the earlier Wiltshire plan, anticipated an English invasion by Henry Tudor, of which Richard was fully aware having intercepted a letter sent in November from Henry to allies in England.²⁴ Uncomfortably aware of Henry Tudor's enhanced status as a

-
- 19. For Tyrell, Davies, *op.cit.*; and for pardons *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 504, 507, 511, 526, 532, 543; see also *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 268. Dorset was apparently followed by Humphrey Cheyney who escorted him back to Henry Tudor.
 - 20. *Vergil*, p. 556; Virgoe, 'Sir John Risley 1443-1512: Courtier and Councillor', pp. 142-3; *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 379; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 282. Bensted received a pardon in March, 1485: *C.P.R.* 1476-85, p. 543.
 - 21. See Green, 'Historical Notes of a London citizen, 1483-1488', p. 589; *The Great Chronicle of London*, pp. 234-6; Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p. 199; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 155.
 - 22. For Mortimer, Somerville, *op.cit.*, pp. 636, 648; for Sturgeon, Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 279.
 - 23. Davies, *op.cit.*, p. 10; Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 280-3; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 1, p. 287.
 - 24. Davies, *op.cit.*, pp. 9-10.

political rival for the English crown, Richard on guard against invasion through 1484, reacted with alarm and alerted every county in the kingdom in December that the exiles now 'confedered with our ancient enemies of France'.²⁵ Yet others left the country through 1485 and Richard was dogged by further intrigue. One plot involved men from Peterhouse, a college with which Morton had close ties, and from which he drew his retinue. Another intrigue, centered perhaps at Winchelsea, Sussex, involved John Devenish, Thomas and Roger Fiennes, and quite possibly their brother and Richard's knight, Robert Fiennes. Disaffection persisted in Sussex and in early August leading esquire Richard Culpepper was bound in £100 with four other esquires, to attend the King when summoned and to behave 'as a true liegeman'.²⁶ On alert at Nottingham castle from early June, 1485, Richard prepared the kingdom and ordered a general muster on 22 June. However it was not until 7 August that Henry Tudor sailed into Milford Sound with his company, their ranks having been swelled during the months in exile.

²⁵. Griffiths and Thomas, *op.cit.*, p. 120; Ross, *Richard III*, p. 206.

²⁶. Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 298; Davies, *op.cit.*, pp. 9-10; for Culpepper, *Memorials*, no. 301.

CONCLUSION

1. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF 1483 IN THE REIGN OF RICHARD III

It began prematurely in the Kentish woodland in early October, and within days it was clear the revolt was doomed. The duke of Norfolk quickly informed the King and before the month was out the rising was over. The significance of the rebellion was not immediately clear either to Richard or the country at large. Yet within weeks the political structure of the South was transformed as King and country grappled with the changes necessitated by 'Buckingham's rebellion'.

It is strange that the episode which marked the beginning of Richard's downfall was not accorded a title for over four hundred years. It is, moreover, ironic that the term, 'Buckingham's rebellion' was used by Gairdner, the first to invest the revolt with significance, to detail gentry disaffection and to see it as the catalyst in Richard's demise. Building on Gairdner's interpretation, C. Ross, ninety years on challenged his title as misleading and incorrect. Yet on a number of fundamentals, the two are in accord. As Gairdner, however, shaped his analysis of 1483 largely in terms of the crown's reaction, his emphasis is still on the leading figures. The main emphasis for Ross, in contrast, is on the independent action of the gentry, united through kinship in the counties and service at court. R. Horrox also draws on Gairdner's themes, amplifying and exploring as well aspects of the revolt hitherto largely ignored, and has shown the importance of the rising in terms of its size, duration and extent. Further, in stressing continuity of service under Richard, Horrox adds another facet to Ross's analysis of gentry participation, by demonstrating that the rebels, for the most part, were not motivated either by faction or mercenary objectives. Gairdner, Ross and Horrox have explored the meaning of 1483 in terms of its impact on the crown and the latter in terms of its commentary on the gentry. Importantly, all three have seen the significance of the rising in terms of a profound statement against Richard III, and, by implication at least, a reflection on the Yorkist polity. However only through detailed and sustained analysis of the rebels - their history, power and service - on the size of the revolt and on the political dislocation it created, can its full impact be assessed. In addition, it may be possible to answer the question - who were the rebel gentry? and to offer some suggestions as to why they rebelled.

By 1483 leading knights and esquires in the South were well-placed to mount a revolt against Richard III. The structure of landed society in the South and its socio-political

framework gave the local leaders a large degree of political independence. It allowed them to conduct their own affairs and direct those of lesser colleagues, and, in addition, to mix with the nobility throughout the regions and at court, where many were on familiar terms with the King himself.

Throughout the period the court and the royal family maintained a strong presence in the South through royal estates, official duties and recreational interests which meant frequent trips into the Home Counties and beyond. For leading gentry these visits brought recognition and offices on crown estates, which, in turn, led to service with, and for, numerous nobles with landed concerns in the South. The ways in which royal and aristocratic influences were mediated by leading gentry families, meant, for an oligarchy in the South, a considerable degree of political power. This, of course, was not new: generations of the same families had served both royal and noble interests. What is different about the period is the effect of the political changes from the early 1460s on gentry interests. By 1483 the old nobility was depleted due both to extinction and attainder. In addition power at the top and in the regions had altered markedly. At the same time a process within the counties - not new but by 1483 more noticeable - saw the emergence of a number of rich local landowners, of comparatively modest standing, take the spotlight alongside many of the old and established nobles. Their landed wealth and power were the result of generations of prudent marriage alliances, purchase and royal patronage. This power was constantly reinforced through their service on the land, and most channelled the ensuing profits back into their own vast holdings. In the absence, in most areas, of divisive magnate interests, leading gentry were well-placed to dominate local society. Further, their role in the regions maintained their avenue to court.

An examination of the functions, concerns and status of the leaders within a locality, a county and a region, reveals the flow-on effect of royal service in terms of influence and control exercised by them. In turn, it highlights the existence of a framework in which the concerns of both greater and lesser gentry were satisfied. The sorts of social cohesion identified in various county studies, extended throughout the South and were perpetuated in the communities by marriage ties and shared landed-interests. In addition, families were linked through administrative work for the crown. In a society where land was the basis of a man's wealth and the source of his power, disputes erupted, but they were most often settled locally, and conflict within the regions did not, in the main, interrupt royal service, prevent business or preclude friendship. There was a definite regional dimension to the activity of the wealthiest southern gentry, recognised by the crown, which at times called key men from most counties to sit on commissions or to stand as sureties for colleagues.

The same sorts of solidarity facilitated by kinship ties and mutual concerns existed among the gentry leaders and resident nobles in the South. Mutually-beneficial action was also a frequent occurrence between the group and non-resident nobles, whom the gentry served in estate-management. Again, disputation was commonplace, but even serious rows between the gentry and leading aristocrats were most often contained and resolved, with little evidence of long-term rifts or a permanent souring of relations. For the gentry, their connections with the higher aristocracy through service in land and local administration reinforced their ties at court and with the King, and a substantial body of evidence attests to the warmth and productivity of their friendships with, and service to, leading courtiers and Edward himself. In turn, the stability and flexibility of local society, largely fostered by powerful gentry, was utilised and rewarded by the crown.

There is another facet to gentry activity which enhanced their position both at home and at court, and likewise benefited the crown. Most were clients of the rich and famous in both a public and private sense, serving in private households as lawyers, administrators and councillors. Noble households were often the springboard to court, and many made their way first in service to eminent aristocrats and subsequently, often simultaneously at court. Yet again, the gentry were not necessarily dependent on noble patronage to gain royal notice. Gentry service to the crown itself brought rewards, and as many of the same families - regional powers and smaller fish - had served for generations, they were well-placed to continue the tradition. Their service in the regions took many forms, and although not a hard and fast rule, the offices they obtained were usually commensurate with their own wealth and standing. Not always, but often enough, moderately wealthy gentry with localised power served as minor officials, customers in the ports, tax collectors, and escheators. Further up the scale talented careerists specialised in estate-management, serving as receivers and auditors of vast crown lands, while the wealthiest gentry were selected as constables of royal castles, stewards and keepers on royal estates. This last category formed an elite, an aristocracy of wealth, born and bred to a tradition of service; men who had proved themselves over many years, and who, like their forebears, were prominent at court and about the King. By 1483, in fact, all the leaders of 'Buckingham's rebellion' were knights and esquires of the body or had occupied other offices of trust and importance within the royal household. It is little surprising that the dislocation caused by the revolt was immense both in the regions and at court. As Ross says, it was essentially a rebellion of Edward IV's former household servants; but it was, in addition, much more. The common factor uniting the proscribed, and hundreds more who were penalised and/or pardoned by Richard III, was service to Edward IV.

Numerically, geographically and chronologically, the rising was substantial. In terms of numbers an accurate assessment of the revolt is problematic. The Act of Attainder, is not, in

itself, an adequate yardstick by which to gauge its participants or measure its impact. The chronicle sources and surviving indictments add to the roll-call of rebels, but to ascertain the scale of the rising it is necessary to use other indicators. Importantly an analysis of a representative sample of the proscribed, composed of fifty-five knights, esquires and gentlemen, indicates that sixty and forty-six percent of Edward's southern knights and esquires of the body (respectively) rebelled; an astonishingly high percentage, the more so because behind each 'leader' were clearly many more men of substance. Likewise, using the same group and focussing on their appointments to the shrievalty, 1478-1482, and the final peace commissions of Edward's reign in fifteen southern counties, forty-eight percent of the former and thirty-four percent of the latter, rebelled. Again the surprising feature is the large household element involved. Of the peace commissioners, seventeen of the thirty-six knights represented, rebelled in 1483; eight of the thirty-six were knights of the body, six of whom rebelled. Twelve of the twenty-seven esquires, rose, including seven of the ten esquires of the body represented.

An analysis of the peace commissions also supports the theory that the revolt was widespread, involving not simply the counties from Cornwall through to Kent and up to East Anglia, but further afield as well. The omission from the bench after the revolt of prominent knights and esquires from the Midlands and the North, as well as the South indicates at most, disaffection, and, at least, insecurity on the part of the crown. Many of these men also lost their court positions under Richard; and again, the common factor among the group is service to Edward both at court and in the counties. In addition, the new King was not sure of a number of men on whom he was forced to rely. Having lost at least fifty-three percent of his brother's knights and esquires of the body in the South, and, at a conservative estimate, forty percent of his regional power-brokers and key administrative officers, Richard was hard-pressed to replace these men with trustworthy servants of like stature. His uncertainty is reflected in his appointments to the shrievalty in November 1483, of men who, simultaneously, were dismissed from other posts and obtained little or nothing else during his reign. Similarly there were others who were removed from the bench and all county offices after the revolt, but retained at court. The dislocation created by such an exodus of expertise, is, however, most significantly reflected in the King's use of northern replacements in the South.

Uncertainty and dislocation are also reflected in the pardon rolls. As the official indictments and chronicles augment the Act of Attainder, and a survey of the peace commissions indicates the probable disaffection of many more men, the pardon rolls shed light on many others including a number of nobles, knights and esquires who were, quite possibly, involved in sedition, or who felt they could be implicated by enemies. It includes those who felt themselves under suspicion, or were viewed as such by the crown. The numerous categories of petitioners from leading nobles through to yeomen and husbandmen, reinforce the notion of the 'perceived'

weight of the revolt by crown and country alike. While the majority of pardons are from the South (with the highest proportion from the South West), once again the common link among the petitioners, North and South, is service to Edward IV.

Richard's response to the rising, however, is the best guide to its significance. And he dealt severely with the rebels, compounding, at the same time, his own problems. The men who were proscribed were those most actively associated with the crown through service on its estates, in its ports and towns, on its commissions and at court. Initially the King had made a concerted effort to promote the continuity of the Yorkist polity. Yet his failure was complete. This is attested by his inability to win-over Edward's most prominent household servants and regional powers, whom he had actively and deliberately cultivated; the men who became, ironically, the leaders of the October revolt. As Horrox has demonstrated, few Woodville supporters lost ground under Richard and even men such as Sir Thomas St Leger and John Cheyney who lost positions in the regions and the household, were prominent at the King's coronation, indicating that their eclipse was not permanent or total. The nominations for, and recipients of, knighthood in 1483, the promotion to and retention of men in Edward V's household, and then presumably in Richard's, the minimal disruption in central administration, the continued service and rich rewards of his brother's men rather than his own in the regions, demonstrate the new King's desire for continuity.

In fact in June and July, while rumour and intrigue were rife, the bench pruned, commissions of enquiry instituted, and men lost their lives - the future rebels prospered. And though the King was not comfortable with all of Edward's men, demonstrably the majority most closely identified with the late King's household - the regional leaders - benefited. Of all the former King's servants, they had least reason to rebel. Yet within weeks Richard was forced to replace half his southern sheriffs, and sixty-one percent of his own bench selections, thirty-five percent of whom had actually rebelled. Needless to say, the common factor among the most powerful rebels was their status at court as household knights and esquires, and their key role in the regions. They had maintained the channels of communication from the regions to court, providing the King with a direct line to local concerns and prospective servants. The removal of the men best qualified to serve the crown in this capacity and the severance of the King's connection with the counties, spelt Richard's ruin. Possibly never before nor since has a King ruled in such isolation.

His reaction to the revolt was immediate and severe, and he indicted one hundred men who were later attainted. Yet the attainders reflect his predicament. Aware both of the ramifications of the gentry's removal from public life, and on guard against alienating the remaining powers in the South, the King was forced to restrict their number. However his rush

to confiscate and redistribute their lands and offices before the attainders had been legally sanctioned, and, in addition, those of a number who avoided attainder, sealed his fate. Having lost over forty percent of gentry leaders in the South, and unable or unwilling to trust many more, the men from the North on whom he was forced to rely were never integrated into southern society. Despite Richard's desperate attempts to confer on them political status and local acceptance, they could not replace the servants whose wealth and power had been won over the generations, and records attest that their failure, like the King's, was total.

Aware of the disintegration of regional society, yet Richard was caught fast. This is reflected in the pattern of punishment after the revolt. The vast majority of attainted rebels from the South West who fled to Brittany neither petitioned for nor received pardons. Conversely many from the Home Counties, were able successfully to avoid attainder and later obtained a pardon from the crown. Doubtless many factors influenced both the rebels' decision to petition and the crown's response to the request. What is clear, however, is Richard's refusal to accept any of the proscribed back into public life. And the rewards of his northern servants in terms of offices and lands reflect both their new role in the South and the severity of the rebels' punishment. Yet though his northern replacements were never accepted, they could not be removed any more than the rebels could be reinstated. Richard's response, in fact, to 'Buckingham's rebellion' was as unprecedented as the rising itself. The rapid and wholesale redistribution of the gentry's land in the South and the introduction into the regions of northerners was not the act of a King with alternatives, but the response of a man with no choice.

2. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF 1483 IN THE YORKIST POLITY

Unfortunately for Richard, Edward's second rule, 1471-83, was one of unity and consolidation, reflected both in the household and the regions. For this reason alone Richard was always facing an up-hill battle with his brother's servants. The harmony achieved by the late King from 1471 which benefited the kingdom, had been hard-won. The periods of instability from 1459-64 and particularly in 1469-71, were not, to say the least, desirable. Instability jeopardised the interests of the land-owning classes, the people who prospered at court and maintained law and order for the crown at the local level - ironically- the very people who, in response to Richard's own actions, threw the Yorkist polity into chaos in 1483. For this reason, however, 'Buckingham's rebellion' demonstrates the maturity of the Yorkist polity. While the political upheaval after Edward's death unsettled the country, the rebels lost nothing. Their livelihood was not threatened; in fact they obtained further patronage under Richard. On the

other hand, they had everything to lose if they failed in revolt. Their rebellion demonstrates their unequivocal opposition to a King whose actions were unacceptable. In the context of fifteenth-century politics, numerous motives for the 1483 revolt have been ascribed the gentry. Yet in most analyses, important factors have often been overlooked or underrated: the generations of service provided by them, the political stability during Edward's second rule, and the interplay of these with the power and independence of the leading gentry during this period.

In 1483 the names of most of the leading rebels were doubtless familiar to King Richard as the men with whom he had associated during his brother's crisis in 1469-71; men most prominent in Edward's household, who along with Gloucester had accompanied the King into exile. The tradition of service these families had provided in the counties and at court would not have set the majority apart as dissidents in 1483. In fact most had served the crown in this way from at least the 1420s and many, earlier still. Linked with powerful patrons at court, including Henry Beaufort, cardinal bishop of Winchester and his protege, the duke of Suffolk, these families formed a broad band of influence across the South from the West Country to East Anglia, where they occupied the shrievalty, the bench and represented their counties in parliament. While their patronage in the household, and as administrators and councillors owed much to their standing with the Beaufort-Suffolk circle, they nevertheless had other patrons including the Hungerfords, Fienneses, Bourchiers, Lord Moleyns and bishop Ayscough who assisted them in the counties, and helped them to court. Yet the gentry's most powerful patron was the King, who retained the most prominent knights and esquires for service in the household and as his agents in the regions, which, in turn, gave them a 'direct line' to court. Nowhere is this more evident than under Edward IV during the 1470s.

While most leading knights and esquires served the crown first and foremost, patterns of gentry allegiance and activity through the period reflect the influence of magnate rivalries in the East, and particularly in the West. In comparison the Home Counties display a different and constant pattern.

In the West a number of gentry were drawn into active participation in local and national politics through competing powers who sought to control and direct royal patronage and attract local notables. Regional disputes merged on occasion with central conflict, noticeable from the late 1450s when key gentry were drawn into politics at court dominated by Margaret of Anjou, through the influence of, among others, Lords Bonville, Cobham and Hungerford, the earls of Devon and Wiltshire, and the duke of Somerset. The other leading sphere of magnate power which extended into the Home Counties, centered around the Mowbray duke of Norfolk, and to a lesser degree the young duke of Suffolk and the earl of Oxford. After the death of the first

duke of Suffolk in 1450, Norfolk was able to attract many of his clients, a number of whom also served the duke of York.

The difference between East Anglian and West Country politics in the early 1460s is mirrored in the leadership, which, in the former, supported Edward IV, while in the latter, favoured, at times, the deposed King. The dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk had joined York by October 1460 and came in behind Edward in 1461. Although Norfolk died towards the end of the year (the fourth duke receiving livery in 1465) and Suffolk was a minor until 1463, Edward enjoyed the loyalty of most of their followers: powerful families who had long served the crown including the Wingfields, Brandons and Brewes. In contrast a number of leading West Country families remained disaffected - the Nanfans, Trevelyans, members of the Courtenay family, the Fulfords, Nicholas Latimer, the Hungerfords and the Lanherne Arundels. Yet again many avoided local lords and supported the new King, such as William Treffry, William Twynyho, William and Philip Courtenay, Roger Tocotes, John Cheyney, John Stourton and John Dinham.

From his accession Edward received his strongest support from leading gentry in the Home Counties, many of whom supported him as the earl of March and then entered the household in 1461. This region had long provided kings with retainers; men who, like all prominent southern gentry, had numerous patrons. Generally, however, the Home Counties were free from competing powers, and gentry here were beholden to none - save the King himself. The most prominent among the group are John Fogge, Thomas Bourghier, John Donne, Nicholas Gaynesford, the Hautes, Thomas Fiennes, John Scott and from the Central South, the Stonors, Crofts and the Harcourts. It is not surprising that the gentry in the Home Counties, an area free from intrusive noble interests and close to court, should, for the most part, have consistently supported the crown. The wealth and status of these men may not have surpassed leading gentry in the East or West. However, as a group they possessed more political independence than some of their colleagues at court, which, in the early 1460s gave them a free hand. Of course not all here supported Edward in 1461, and George Brown and William Norris are two important exceptions. Despite, however, their early support of the deposed Henry VI, the former rose quickly in service to the duke of Clarence, while the latter was Edward's knight by 1465.

While the West proved troublesome to Edward through the early 1460s, many of his early opponents were soon employed in local administration including Richard Edgecombe, Sir John Arundel of Trerice, esquires Remfry and John Arundel, John Colshull, Maurice Berkeley of Beverstone, John Paulet, Thomas Uvedale, Roger Tocotes, George Darrell and Thomas Delamare. The respite from rebellion enjoyed by the crown in the mid-1460s saw Norfolk

consolidate his power in East Anglia, while in the West the duke of Clarence became the dominant figure absorbing into his retinue traditional followers of the Hungerfords, and the earls of Devon and Warwick. His patronage extended to local notables including the Latimers and Luttrells, Robert Willoughby, the Courtenays of Powderham, and Sir Hugh of Boconnoc, John Twynyho, Roger Tocotes, John Halwell, Richard Nanfan, Thomas Fulford, Richard Edgecombe, John St Lo, Edmund Hungerford, Sir John Arundel of Lanherne and Sir Thomas St Leger. Clearly his retinue, buttressed by Neville power, was formidable. When in 1469 Clarence joined the earl of Warwick in sedition and revolt, not surprisingly a number of those most closely identified with the rebels, were implicated.

Many of these men and others in the East prospered in local administration during the Readeption, through their connections with Warwick or Clarence, or through the latter's allies such as the East Anglian earl of Oxford. Those with a history of service to Edward IV, including the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, were in eclipse. Yet nor did Clarence employ all his clients in the West; and men who avoided the conflict and received or accepted little during Edward's exile include the Dinhams, John Crocker, the Willoughbys, Henry Bodrugan, Sir John Arundel of Trerice, John Biconell, John Halwell, John Colshull, Walter Hungerford, St Leger and the Treffrys. On the other hand, those who were employed during the Readeption including Oxfordshire esquire Thomas Stonor and knights Edmund Rede and Thomas Delamare, along with stalwart followers of Clarence, were not viewed as dissidents on the King's return as their rewards indicate.

Undeniably, however, the household element in the Home Counties was most committed in its support for Edward during his absence - George Brown and John Guildford, followers of Warwick, being two important exceptions. Edward's most prominent knights and esquires - Fogge, the Hautes, St Leger, the Gaynesfords, Thomas Bourghier, Sir William Norris, Sir John Scott, Sir Richard Harcourt, Richard Croft, Sir Thomas Vaughan, Walter Hungerford and others had either followed him into exile, had themselves taken sanctuary, or like Bourghier, were under arrest.

Aware of the problems which could arise from a narrow power-base and land-hungry nobles, Edward sought to remedy this situation after his victory at Tewkesbury in 1471, by redefining the boundaries of regional authority. His blood relations and the Woodvilles were the chief beneficiaries in the regions, and while the dukes of Clarence and Gloucester shared Warwick's forfeited lands in the West and North, respectively, the Woodvilles also consolidated their interests in the South West, the Marches and Wales through their control of an extensive unit of regional government based on the Prince of Wales's council at Ludlow. The King, in fact, created a second court whose servants were loyal to the Prince, and to whom they

looked for preferment. Lords Hastings and Stanley were prominent members in Edward's territorial scheme, while casualties included powerful nobles such as the second earl of Pembroke and the young duke of Buckingham.

For the gentry in the regions, patterns of patronage had not altered markedly after Tewkesbury, and in accordance with the crown's policy, former rebels were encouraged back into public life. Through the early 1470s, John Mowbray duke of Norfolk reigned in the East, while the Howards, recently ennobled, were King's lieutenants there. In the West, Clarence remained a major force, though the Woodvilles, particularly Dorset, were steadily accumulating power, and a number of lords and gentry also shared the spotlight. In fact from around 1473 a number of the duke's clients broadened their political contacts and shifted their main focus. Many were in service to numerous patrons, resident and non-resident nobles such as Lord Stourton and the duke of Buckingham. Almost all, however, were patronised by the Woodvilles, whose connections are evident in the parliament of 1478, when, after Clarence's death a number of his former servants then sat through their Woodville links. The Home County gentry, Edward's knights and esquires, had been most richly patronised by the family, demonstrated by their local and court appointments. At Edward's death, however, Woodville influence had permeated the South and is most evident in the appointments to the subsidy commission of 27 April 1483. The list of their clients closely resembles the names supplied in the Act of Attainder, and while, demonstrably, the gentry had numerous patrons, by 1483, none of their contacts were as blatantly political as their ties with the Woodvilles.

Edward's policies in the regions which promoted his service gentry and advanced his kinsmen, brought rewards at court. Under Edward the household had always exerted a unifying influence over the gentry in closest proximity to court, evident in the South East in 1469-70. Yet through the 1460s, the household had not reached its potential as a political force. It lacked both unity and cohesion, and from around 1469 Edward consciously sought to remedy this by investing his men with autonomy in the regions, and power at court through important commissions and offices. The first signs of success were visible during the King's exile, and more particularly at Barnet and Tewkesbury. This, in turn, enabled him to reward all manner of servants, most particularly his own opposition, and gave him the confidence to promote, more actively, his men in this way. In this he had great success, and by 1483 Edward had united the household from the West through to East Anglia. His policies at the centre and in the counties created a climate in which his servants prospered, and a stability which undoubtedly strengthened his hand.

While the gentry acted in much the same way as their forbears in terms of service within the regions and at court, there were, undeniably, certain elements which worked to their

advantage, and assisted the King. The depletion of the ranks of the old nobility; the rise of new powers, particularly the Woodvilles, with their abundant patronage; and the absence, in the main, of divisive magnate interests, most notably in the West, accorded the gentry an unprecedented degree of power and political independence. Simultaneously, the increased status of the household, involving men who for generations had been the link between King and country, created an atmosphere in the South which encouraged cooperation and fostered stability. Gentry in the South took their cue from the King and the harmony achieved both in the regions and at court is testament to their success, and the quality of Edward's kingship.

When the ill-starred Richard III became King in late June 1483 he was, perhaps, already living on borrowed time. The deposition of Edward V had outraged his brother's servants, who as Ross pointed out, could accept him as Protector but never as King. The disappearance and presumed murder of the boys at some point through the summer, stiffened the resolve of political society in its determination to rid England of Richard. For his part, it is difficult to believe that the new King was unaware of his enormous task in winning over the Yorkist polity; of securing, in particular, the loyalty of the household who, under Edward, had become even more indispensable in government than their predecessors. Yet even while uncertainty and indecision are reflected in his rule, in those early weeks Richard seemed content to live in the future; as if the taste of power which had sharpened his appetite to consolidate his gains, had also blurred his vision. Clearly he sought to secure the household through his generous patronage; for the rest - their support could be won later. Richard, of course, ran out of time. 'Buckingham's rebellion' came too early and involved too many for him ever to recover. Moreover the disaffection which spread over the Channel and then back into Westminster, proved impossible to stem. He needed a decisive victory at Bosworth, which as Horrox says might well have provided him with a base for effective reconstruction of the Yorkist polity. As it was, after the rising he was unable to recover the initiative sufficiently to stop the sedition and to secure the South.

Richard's desire to preserve Edward IV's power-structure is eloquent testimony to the late King's achievements. This is further reinforced by Henry VII's maintenance of many of Edward's policies and personnel. Notwithstanding Edward's success, the desire of political society to maintain the status-quo was not new. It was in the interests of all - Kings, nobles and gentry - to strive for continuity of government. Richard appeared to have initial success, evident in May and early June 1483, when, after the removal of the Woodvilles, the Yorkist polity survived. While the South could accept his provisional government, however, it would not acknowledge the legitimacy of his kingship. Increasingly through the summer of 1483,

political society voiced its disapproval of Richard's usurpation, and, by a process which would continue until his downfall, began to withdraw its service and support. The gentry took the lead in this process, and tasted success in Richard's defeat.

The last Plantagenet's brief reign raises the issue of how far 'loyalty to the office rather than the man' had become the driving-force in politics. Through their revolt in 1483 the gentry demonstrated both their outrage against Richard III for disinheriting and destroying Edward V, and their loyalty to the late King, Edward IV. Above all, however, they demonstrated, through rebellion against a perceived usurper, the degree to which the notion of 'abstract obedience to the crown' had replaced the concrete reality of personal loyalty to the King.¹

1. Horrox, *op.cit.*, pp. 326-8.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

KNIGHTS AND SQUIRES OF THE BODY AND HOUSEHOLD OF EDWARD IV 1461-1483

KNIGHTS OF THE BODY

John Astley (Leics)	<i>B.L.H.M.</i> , Vol. 4, p. 6
Maurice Berkeley (Gloucs, d. 1474)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 391
George Brown (Surrey)	<i>Archaeologia</i> , I, p. 352
Thomas Burgh (Lincs)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 208
Thomas Bourghier (Surrey)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 333
Robert Chamberlain (Norf)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 536
Gervase Clifton (Notts)	<i>Memorials</i> , no. 238
Giles Daubenay (Somerset)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p. 259
Gilbert Debenham (Suffolk)	<i>P.R.O.</i> , C67/51/9
John Ferrers (Staffs)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p.
Thomas Grey (Cambs)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 126
John Grisley (Derbys)	<i>B.L.H.M.</i> , Vol. 4, p. 87
James Harrington (Yorks)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 151
Ralph Hastings (Northants, Leics, Essex)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 440
John Middleton (Northumb)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 199
Thomas Montgomery (Essex)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1461-7, p. 79
Charles Pilkington (Notts)	<i>B.L.H.M.</i> , Vol. 4, p. 155
John Pilkington (York, d. 1479)	<i>Memorials</i> , no. 444
William Norris (Berks)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p. 640
John Savage (Ches)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 413
William Stanley (Denb)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 556
Thomas St Leger (Surrey)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 114
William Stonor (Oxon)	<i>Stonor Letters</i> , no. 247
Humphrey Talbot	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 396
William Trussell (d. 1481)	<i>BL Stowe Ms 440 f. 71</i>
Thomas Vaughan (exec. June 1483)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 9
Robert Wingfield (d. 1481)	<i>Horrox, op.cit.</i> , p. 263
Edward Woodville (Northants)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 199
Thomas Wortley (Yorks)	<i>P.R.O.</i> , E 404/78/2/7

SQUIRES OF THE BODY

Thomas Audley (Dorset)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 299
William Berkeley (Gloucs)	<i>P.R.O.</i> , E 404/77/2/61
James Blount (Staffs)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p. 84
John Blount	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 413
Edward Brampton (Middsx)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 318
Giles Brugge (Glouc)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p. 111
John Cheyney (Wilts)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 160
Christopher Colyns (Middsx)	<i>Archaeologia</i> I, p. 350
Thomas Cokesay (Worcs)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 46
John Courtenay (Devon)	<i>Memorials</i> , no. 52
Avery Cornburgh (Devon)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 41
Richard Croft (Oxon)	<i>C.C.R.</i> , 1476-85, no. 861

Thomas Darcy (Essex)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 334
Jonne Donne (Bucks knt and not esq by 1483)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p.59
Henry Ferrers	Rowney, Ph.D., p.158
Thomas Fiennes (Sussex)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 180
John Fortescue (Herts)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 589
Thomas Fowler (Bucks)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p. 352
Nicholas Gaynesford (Surrey)	<i>Memorials</i> , no. 295
Richard Grey	Morgan, <i>op.cit.</i> , p. 65
John Hulcote (d. Jan. 1483)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 227
James Haute (Kent)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p.323
John Hugford (Warw)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 319
Walter Hungerford (Wilts)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p. 486
Halneth Malyverer (Yorks)	<i>Archaeologia</i> I, p. 352
John Mortimer (Worcs)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , pp. 613-4
John Norris (Berks)	<i>B.L.H.M.</i> , Vol. 4, p. 145
Robert Poyntz (Gloucs)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 261
Robert Ratcliffe (Lancs?)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 19
John Risley (Suffolk)	<i>P.R.O.</i> , <i>P.R.O.</i> , C67/51/13
John Sapcote (Devon)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 218
Thomas St Leger (see also knight of body)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 182
John Sturgeon (Herts)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 264
Brian Talbot (Lincs)	<i>Rot. Parl.</i> , VI, p. 83
John Timperley (Suffolk)	<i>B.L.H.M.</i> , Vol. 4, p. 199
William Tirwhit (Lincs)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 342
Thomas Tyrell (Suffolk)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 135
William Uvedale (Hants)	<i>Wedgwood</i> , p. 892
Thomas Vaughan (Wales)	BL Stowe Ms 440, f. 71
Henry Vernon (Derbys)	R. Horrox, Ph. D. Appendix
John Wikes (Glouc)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 37
John Wingfield (Suffolk)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 285
Guy Wolston (Northants)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1487-85, p. 172

KING'S KNIGHTS

Richard Croft	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 411
Walter Devereux, Lord Ferrers	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 95
William, Lord Herbert	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 22
John, Lord Howard	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 538
William Norris (see also knights of body)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 198
James Ratcliffe	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 159
Humphrey Stafford, Lord Southwick (briefly earl of Devon, d. 1469)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 22
Richard Tunstall	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 227
Roger Vaughan	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 185
John Waynflete	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p.263
John, Lord Wenlock	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 99

KING'S SQUIRES

Robert Clifford	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 47
Thomas Fiennes (see also esquires of body)	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1467-77, p. 589
Richard Harcourt	
John Huddleston	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1476-85, p. 93

Halnath Malyverer
William Middleton
William Mulso
Christopher Talbot
William Twynyho

C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 99
C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 242
C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 437
C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 402
C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 278

SQUIRES OF THE HOUSEHOLD

Thomas Bassett
Henry Wentworth

Wedgwood
Sayer, op.cit., p. 308

APPENDIX 2

SHERIFFS AND MEMBERS OF PEACE COMMISSIONS IN THE LAST YEARS OF EDWARD IV'S REIGN

SHERIFFS 1478-1482

CORNWALL

1478 - Robert Willoughby kt
1479 - Richard Nanfan esq
1480 - Thomas Granville
1481 - Thomas Fulford kt
1482 - John Treffry esq

DEVONSHIRE

1478 - Edward Courtenay esq
1479 - Halneth Malyverer
1480 - Robert Willoughby kt
1481 - Giles Daubenay kt
1482 - William Courtenay kt

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

1478 - Edward Langley esq
1479 - Walter Dennis esq
1480 - John St Lo kt
1481 - Robert Poyntz esq
1482 - Alexander Baynham esq

HAMPSHIRE

1478 - John Cook
1479 - William Uvedale esq
1480 - Edward Berkeley esq
1481 - John Brocas esq
1482 - Robert Poyntz esq

KENT

1478 - Richard Lee esq
1479 - John Fogge kt
1480 - George Brown kt
1481 - Richard Haute esq
1482 - William Haute kt

SOMERSET - DORSET

1478 - William Say esq
1479 - Edward Hardgill esq
1480 - Giles Daubenay kt
1481 - Richard Morton gent
1482 - Nicholas Crowmer esq

SURREY - SUSSEX

1478 - Thomas Coombes esq
1479 - John Elrington kt
1480 - Thomas Fiennes esq
1481 - John Apsey esq
1482 - Henry Rose kt

WILTSHIRE

1478 - Walter Hungerford esq
1479 - Charles Bulkeley
1480 - William Colyng esq
1481 - John Mompesson
1482 - Henry Long esq

OXFORDSHIRE - BERKSHIRE

1478 - John Norris esq
1479 - Humphrey Talbot kt
1480 - Thomas Delamare kt
1481 - William Norris kt
1482 - Thomas Kingston

NORFOLK-SUFFOLK

1478 - William Hopton esq
1479 - William Knyvet kt
1480 - Alexander Crassener esq
1481 - Henry Wentworth kt
1482 - John Wingfield esq

**FINAL PEACE COMMISSIONS OF EDWARD IV'S REIGN INDICATING NOBLES,
ECCLESIASTICS, LEGAL CAREERISTS, COUNTY LAWYERS, KNIGHTS, ESQUIRES AND
GENTLEMEN**

CORNWALL: 28 March 1480

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, Thomas, marquis of Dorset

Ecclesiastics: Peter, bishop of Exeter

Legal Careerists: Sir John Catesby, Sir Richard Choke (d. by October 1483)

County Lawyers: Thomas Tresawell, Thomas Lymbery, Thomas Luccombe

Knights: Henry Bodrugan, John Colshull

Esquires: John Carmynewe, Edward Asshton

Gentlemen: Richard Vivian, Peter Tregoy

No rebels from the sample, but Sir John Colshull was removed from the bench on 27 May, 1483; Edward Asshton, Peter Tregoy, Thomas Limbery and Thomas Tresawell were removed from the bench after the rising; Thomas Luccombe was removed after Richard's coronation and reinstated in December 1483.

DEVONSHIRE: 14 June 1482

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, Thomas, marquis of Dorset, John, Lord Zouche, John, Lord Dinham, Edward Grey, Lord Lisle, John Brook, Lord Cobham

Ecclesiastics: Peter, bishop of Exeter, John, abbot of Tavistock

Legal Careerists: Sir John Catesby, William Huddesfield, Thomas Brugge (Bridges)

County Lawyers: Thomas Dourish (d. by October 1483), John Dennis

Knights: Thomas St Leger, William Courtenay, John Crocker, Robert Willoughby

Esquires: John Sapcote, Charles Dinham, John Halwell

Unknown: Richard Wideslade, Thomas Hexte, Thomas Bouring

Four rebels: knights, St Leger, Crocker, Willoughby and esquire John Halwell. In addition both Courtenay and Sapcote were removed in May 1483 (both later reinstated); William Huddesfeld and John Dennis were dropped after the rebellion.

DORSET: 3 March 1483

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, Thomas, marquis of Dorset, John, Lord Audley, John, Lord Stourton, John, Lord Zouche

Ecclesiastics: Lionel, bishop of Salisbury

Legal Careerists: Sir John Catesby, Thomas Bridges, Morgan Kydwelly, Thomas Bridges

County Lawyers: Thomas Hussey, Richard Morton

Knights: Nicholas Latimer

Esquires: John Cheyney, John Carent (d. before 11 July 1483), John Cheverell, Thomas Arundel

Gentlemen: William Martin, John Newborough

Five rebels: Sir Nicholas Latimer and esquires Thomas Arundel, John Cheyney, John Cheverell and gentleman, Richard Morton. Of the rest, Bridges was removed from the bench after June 1483, and Newborough after the rising in October.

SOMERSET: 7 November 1482

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, Thomas, marquis of Dorset, John, Lord Audley, John, Lord Stourton, John Brook, Lord Cobham, William, Lord Berkeley, Edward Grey, Lord Lisle, John, Lord Zouche

Ecclesiastics: Richard, bishop of Bath and Wells, John Gunthorp, dean of St Andrews, Wells, Peter, prior of Bath

Legal Careerists: Richard Choke, John Biconell, John Catesby, Thomas Tremayle, Thomas Bridges

County Lawyers: John Fitzjames, John Higgons, Sir William Paulet

Knights: Sir Giles Daubenay, Nicholas St Lo, John Newton

Esquires: John Trevelyan
Gentlemen: William Paulet
Unknown: Robert Stowell, John Porter
Sample rebels: Sir Giles Daubenay, John Trevelyan; John Higgons was omitted in May, reinstated in July but rebelled in October and was subsequently attainted; also omitted at this time, John Biconell, William Hody, Sir William Paulet and Sir John Newton.

WILTSHIRE: 10 February, 1481

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, William, earl of Arundel, Thomas, marquis of Dorset, lords Audley, Stourton and Zouche
Ecclesiastics: William Waynflete, bishop of Winchester, John, abbot of Malmesbury
Legal Careerists: Sir Richard Choke and Sir John Catesby
County Lawyers: John Whittocksmead (d. 1483), Henry Long, John Mompesson, Robert Baynard and John Benger
Knights: Roger Tocotes and Richard Beauchamp
Esquires: Walter Hungerford, John Cheyney
Gentleman: William Collingbourne
Sample rebels: Roger Tocotes, Richard Beauchamp, John Cheyney and Walter Hungerford. Whittocksmead was removed from the bench on Richard's accession, William Collingbourne and Benger after the rising (Collingbourne was imprisoned for treason and later executed in 1484).

HAMPSHIRE: 17 January, 1481

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, William, earl of Arundel, Anthony, Earl Rivers, Thomas Arundel, Lord Maltravers, lords Audley and Mountjoy
Ecclesiastics: bishops of Winchester, Bath and Wells and Exeter
Legal Careerists: Richard Choke, John Catesby, Richard Jay
County Lawyers: Thomas Welle, John Rogers
Knights: William Sandes, Thomas St Leger
Esquires: William Berkeley, Edward Berkeley, William Uvedale, Nicholas Lisle
Gentlemen: John Paulet, John Brocas
Unknown: Henry More, John Coke
Sample rebels: William Berkeley, William Uvedale and Sir Thomas St Leger; Sir William Sandes was omitted in May, 1483, as were John Coke and John Brocas (both reinstated in June); John Paulet was dropped after Richard's accession along with John Rogers and John Brocas after the revolt.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE: 25 October 1481

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, William, earl of Arundel, Earl Rivers, Thomas, marquis of Dorset, Viscount Lisle, lords Maltravers, Berkeley, Dacre, Beauchamp of Powick and Walter Devereux, Lord Ferrers
Ecclesiastics: bishops of Worcester and Hereford
Legal Careerists: Richard Neele and Thomas Whitingdon
County Lawyers: John Weeks, John Limrick, Thomas Baynham, John Twynyho, Richard Forster
Knights: William Nottingham (d. September 1483) and John St Lo
Esquire: John Cassy (d. in 1483 or soon after)
Unknown: Kenelm Digas
Sample rebel: Sir John St Lo; in addition Thomas Baynham, Kenelm Digas, Richard Forster and Sir Richard Nele were off the commissions in May 1483; those removed after the rising: John Weeks, John Twynyho and Thomas Baynham.

OXFORDSHIRE: 18 February, 1483

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, John, duke of Suffolk, Francis, Lord Lovell
Ecclesiastics: John Russell, bishop of Lincoln, John, abbot of Abingdon

Legal Careerists: John Sulyard, William Jenney, William Danvers, Thomas Danvers, Thomas Croft

County Lawyers: Richard Danvers, Humphrey Forster

Knights: Richard Harcourt, William Stonor, Richard Croft, Richard Woodville, Sir Thomas Vaughan

Esquires: John Harcourt, Richard Grey

Gentleman: Walter Elmes

Unknown: John Langston and Richard Hall

Rebels: Sir William Stonor and John Harcourt esquire; Vaughan was executed in June 1483; after Richard's accession Thomas Croft and Thomas Danvers were dropped (both later reinstated) along with William Jenney and John Sulyard; William Danvers and Walter Elmes were omitted after the rising.

BERKSHIRE: 13 February, 1483

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, John, duke of Suffolk and John, Lord Howard

Ecclesiastics: The bishops of Winchester and Bath and Wells, John, abbot of Abingdon,

Thomas Danet, dean of St George's, Windsor, Lionel Woodville, bishop of Salisbury

Legal Careerists: Thomas Wood, John Sulyard, William Jenney

County Lawyers: John Isbury

Knights: William Norris, Thomas Delamare, Thomas Vaughan, Richard Woodville

Esquires: Richard Grey

Gentlemen: Thomas Say, John Denton, Alexander Cheyney

Unknown: William Stafferton, William Beselles

Rebels: Sir William Norris, Sir Thomas Delamare and Alexander Cheyney; Vaughan was executed in June, 1483; in addition Isbury was dropped in June (reinstated in December) along with Sulyard, Stafferton and Jenney; Denton and Beselles were excluded after the rising.

KENT: 18 November, 1481

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, William, earl of Arundel, Henry, earl of Northumberland, Henry, earl of Essex, Anthony, Earl Rivers, lords Cobham, Dacre and Bergavenny

Ecclesiastics: Thomas Bourghier, archbishop of Canterbury, John, bishop of Rochester

Legal Careerists: William Hussey, Thomas Bryan, John Fineux

County Lawyers: Roger Brent

Knights: Thomas Bourghier, John Fogge, Henry Ferrers, William Haute, John Scott, Reginald Sandes

Gentlemen: Roger Appleton, John Alfegh, Richard Lee

Rebel sample: knights John Fogge, Thomas Bourghier, William Haute and John Scott; Lee was omitted at Richard's accession (reinstated).

SURREY: 24 September, 1479

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, Henry, earl of Northumberland, lords Audley, Stanley, Bergavenny, Dacre

Ecclesiastics: the archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishop of Winchester.

Legal Careerists: Thomas Bryan, John Catesby, William Hussey, William Essex

County Lawyers: William Merston

Knights: Thomas St Leger, George Brown, John Wood,

Esquires: Thomas Basset, Nicholas Gaynesford

Gentlemen: William Marston, William Donnington, Thomas Wintershull, John Holgrave

Rebel sample: Sir Thomas St Leger, Sir George Brown, John and Nicholas Gaynesford esquires; in addition William Hussey was removed from June, along with William Essex, Thomas Basset esquire, William Marston, William Donnington and Thomas Wintershull (bearing in mind the date of this commission, it is quite likely that some were aged or dead by 1483 or had transferred their principal interests elsewhere).

SUSSEX: 5 December, 1481

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, the earls of Arundel and Northumberland, lords Maltravers, Dacre, Hastings, Bergavenny, Delawarre
Ecclesiastics: the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Chichester
Legal Careerists: Sir Thomas Bryan, Thomas Oxenbridge, John Stanney, Sir William Nottingham (d. September 1483)
County Lawyers: Thomas Hoo, Richard Lewkenor (the elder), John Goring, Thomas Stidolf
Knights: Sir John Fiennes (d. by October 1483), Sir Thomas Etchingham, Sir Henry Roos
Esquires: John Wood (the elder), Thomas Lewkenor, Thomas Coombes, John Dudley
Gentleman: John Wood (the younger), Robert Woodfold
Rebel sample: Thomas Lewkenor esquire; those removed after June 1483: Sir Thomas Etchingham, Thomas Stidolf, Robert Woodfold, Sir Henry Roos and Nottingham; excluded after the rebellion: Richard Lewkenor (the elder), Thomas Oxenbridge, John Stanney and John Dudley.

NORFOLK: 13 November, 1482

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, the duke of Suffolk, the earls of Northumberland, Essex and Kent, Earl Rivers, lords Howard and Berkeley
Ecclesiastics: John, bishop of Norwich, John Morton, bishop of Ely
Legal Careerists: Richard Pigot, Henry Heydon, Henry Spilman, Roger Townsend, William Hussey, James Hobart, Richard Southwell
Knights: Sir Thomas Howard (earl of Surrey, June 1483), Sir William Knyvet, Sir Henry Ogard
Esquires: Robert Ratcliffe, Edmund Bedingfield
Gentlemen: John Paston, Tiro Robsert
Unknown: John Wooton, John Fincham
Rebel sample: Sir William Knyvet; John Paston, Sir Henry Ogard and John Wooton were excluded in June, 1483, while Edmund Bedingfield and Tiro Robsert (both knighted in 1483) and James Hobart were excluded after October.

SUFFOLK: 18 April, 1482

Nobles: Richard, duke of Gloucester, John, duke of Suffolk, the earl of Essex, Earl Rivers, John, Lord Howard
Ecclesiastics: John, bishop of Ely
Legal Careerists: Richard Pigot, John Sulyard, Edmund Jenney, Sir William Hussey
Knights: Gilbert Debenham, William Brandon, John Heveningham, Thomas Brewes (d. 1482), Robert Chamberlain
Esquires: Alexander Cressyner, John Wingfield
Gentlemen: William Hopton
Unknown: Thomas Appleton, John Clopton, Thomas Higham
Rebel sample: Sir William Brandon, John Wingfield esquire; in addition Sir Robert Chamberlain was off the bench from June 1483 until February, 1483; Sir John Heveningham was removed permanently.

APPENDIX 3

RECIPIENTS OF PARDONS 1 FEBRUARY - 31 JULY 1484

SOUTHERN KNIGHTS

(For all references except where indicated, *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, P.R.O., *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*, C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 535-580; asterisks indicate service to Edward IV.)

- * Henry Bodrugan of Bodrugan, Cornwall (d. by 1503); knighted in 1476; J.P. for Edward IV and Richard III; knight of the body under Richard (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
William Boleyn of Blickling, Norfolk; recently of Lewes, Sussex, of Kent and of London (d. 1505) (c. 4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- * Thomas Bourghier of Horsley, Surrey and Leeds, Kent; son of Lord Berners of Horsley, Surrey; J.P. Kent and Surrey; steward and keeper for Edward IV; sewer to the king (1461); knight of the body (1478-83) (see above for other details) (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11; also pardoned 7 December 1483 and 27 February, 1484.
- * Thomas Brian, legal careerist and chief justice; recently king's escheater in Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- * Richard Croft the elder, of Croft, Herefordshire; knighted in 1471; spent some years in the duke of York's Herefordshire household; sheriff of Herefordshire (1469, 1471, 1475, 1484); treasurer of the prince of Wales; knight of the body under Edward, not under Richard, but transferred his interests to court replacing Hopton as treasurer of the household (February 25) P.R.O., C67/51/3.
- * John Crocker of Lyneham, Devon; knighted in 1471; J.P. Devon, 1471-4 and 1480-83; omitted May, 1483, reinstated in June/July, removed after the rising (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- * Philip Courtenay of Kingston, Molland and Exeter, Devon; sheriff of Devon (1470); promoted to the bench by Richard, 28 June, 1483 (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- * William Courtenay of Powderham, Devon, recently of Ilton and Exeter, Devon; knighted in 1471; sheriff of Devon (1470, 1482); J.P. in Devon throughout except May 1483; king's servant under Richard (March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- * Gilbert Debenham of Little Wenham, Suffolk (28 February); J.P. Suffolk, king's carver, 1472-83; knight of the body in 1483 (see above for details) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
- * Henry Ferrers of East Peckham, Kent; younger brother of Sir John (d. 1500); king's servant; M.P. Kent, 1472-5; sheriff Kent (1468-9); knighted at Tewkesbury; J.P. Kent from 1471; receiver (see above for details) (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- * Thomas Fulford of Fulford, Devon, recently of Morton, Cornwall; sheriff of Cornwall (1481); J.P. in Devon in May 1483, removed after the rising (March) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
- * Richard Harcourt of Cornbury, Oxfordshire; king's esquire; sheriff of Oxfordshire/Berkshire (1460, 1466); M.P. Oxfordshire and Norfolk; J.P. in Oxfordshire from the 1440s (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- * William Haute of Bishopsbourne, Kent; J.P. in Kent; sheriff of Kent (1465, 1474, 1482); king's servitor in 1461 (see above for details) (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- * John Heveningham of Heveningham, Suffolk; sheriff of Suffolk (1469); J.P. Suffolk (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
- * Thomas Montgomery of Faulkbourne, Essex (d. 1495); lawyer; keeper of the mint 1450-66; marshal of the hall 1447-53; knight of the body 1461-83: C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 79; councillor for Edward, king's carver; yeoman of the chamber, 1476-83; M.P. Essex (1463-5, 1467-8, 1478 ?1483, June, 1484); J.P. Essex; apparently knight of the body under Richard III, but career in eclipse (24 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * Edmund Rede of Boarstall, Buckinghamshire, recently of Barnswode, Shotton and Stowood, Oxfordshire; sheriff of Oxfordshire/Berkshire (1438-9, 1450-1); J.P. in Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire in the 1460s and 1470s; knighted in 1465; M.P. for

Oxfordshire/Berkshire; lawyer and king's servant, *Wedgwood*, p. 711. (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

- * Sir Henry Rose of West Grinstead, Sussex (d. 1504); sheriff of Surrey/Sussex (1482); J.P. Sussex from 1478 (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

William Stocker of Chelsea, Middlesex, merchant, alderman of London (10 July) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

- * Thomas Thwaites of Barnes, Surrey (d. 1503) bailiff of Guisnes, chancellor of Lancaster; emissary to Calais, treasurer of Calais (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
- * Henry Wentworth of Nettlestead, Suffolk, Chetham and Kingston, Kent and of Magna Lymbergh and of Poynton, Lincolnshire; J.P. Suffolk; sheriff Norfolk/Suffolk 1481, (c. 10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.

MIDLAND AND NORTHERN KNIGHTS

- * John Bourghier of Groby, Leicestershire, recently of Astley, Warwickshire, recently of Dely and Stebbing, Essex, recently of London (d. 1495); fourth son of Henry, earl of Essex (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 - * Thomas Burgh of Gainsborough, Lincolnshire; esquire and knight of the body, 1461-83; master of the horse, 1465-83; sheriff of Lincolnshire (1460); M.P. Lincoln; K.G. and privy councillor to Edward IV; J.P. in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire; knight of the body to Richard III by March, 1484: *C.P.R.*, p. 385; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 31. P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 - * Gervase Clifton of Clifton and Hodstock, Nottinghamshire; knighted at Richard's coronation and a knight of the body by August, 1484: *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 475; royal receiver for Edward IV and a retainer of Hastings: *ibid.*, p. 19, Dunham, *op.cit.*, p. 118; J.P. in Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Staffordshire and Yorkshire (all Ridings) only under Richard; sheriff Nottinghamshire 1477, 1482 (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 - * Robert Constable of Flamborough, Yorkshire and Somerby, Lincolnshire (d.1488); sheriff of Yorkshire (1461, 1478) and of Lincolnshire (1466) (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 - * Thomas Cornwall of Weobley and Ashton, Herefordshire, (d. 1501); sheriff of Herefordshire (1452, 1466, 1483); sheriff of Shropshire/Staffordshire (1458) (6 July) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 - * John Grisley of Drakelow, Derbyshire and Colton, Staffordshire (d. 1487) (uncle of the Stanley brothers of Elford and a permanent member of Hastings's retinue); knighted 1452/3; J.P. for Edward IV in Staffordshire from 1461; sheriff of Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire, 1453; knight of the body under Edward but not Richard (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 - * Robert Harrington of Pinchbeck, Lincolnshire; presumably the knight of the body to Richard, also of Badsworth, Yorkshire (brother of James, d. c. 1487); a member of Gloucester's council and 'recently escheator for Edward IV' in Lincoln; attainted after Bosworth (c. 26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
 - * Roger Kynaston of Myddle and Knockin, Shropshire, recently of Harlech, North Wales (d. 1492); king's servant, constable of Harlech; sheriff of Merioneth: *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 115; Myddle and Knockin were manors held by Lord Strange, son of Thomas, Lord Stanley. Kynaston was also associated with the Talbots; sheriff of Shropshire and Staffordshire (1461, 1469, and 1471, when knighted) (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- Thomas Manley of Manley, Cheshire (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * Robert Markham of Coten, Nottinghamshire, and of Lincolnshire; sheriff, Lincolnshire (1475), and of Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire (1479); J.P. Nottinghamshire (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
- Sir Humphrey Page of Gillisland, Cumberland (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
- * Henry Pierpoint of Valley, Derbyshire, recently of Holbeck Woodhouse, Nottinghamshire (d. 1499); M.P. Nottinghamshire (1472-5); sheriff of Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire (1468, 1471 when knighted); J.P. in Nottinghamshire from May 1470 - 28 June, 1483 when removed (26 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 - * Charles Pilkington of Gateford, Nottinghamshire, recently of Bury, Lancashire and of Hatfield and Somerby, Yorkshire; knight of the body to Edward; J.P.

Nottinghamshire; sheriff Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire in 1481 (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/32.

- * John Savage senior of Macclesfield, Cheshire and recently of Clifton, Cheshire and Tillington, Staffordshire (d. 1495); kinsman of the Stanleys; king's knight by 1478: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 94; knight of the body to Richard : B.L.H.M., Vol. 4, p. 175; fought against the king with his sons at Bosworth (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- William Stanley of Hooton Cheshire and Holt, Denbigh (d. 1495); the brother of Thomas Lord Stanley; sheriff of Cheshire and Flint (1463); king's knight by 1462: C.P.R., 1461-7, p. 198; knight of the body to Richard whom he deserted at Bosworth; B.L.H.M., Vol. 4, p.189 (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
- * Humphrey Starkey of Shropshire, chief baron of the exchequer (d. 1486); J.P. Shropshire under Richard (31 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- Richard Strangeways of West Harsley, Yorkshire (d. 1488) (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

ESQUIRES

(For all references except where indicated, B.L.H.M., Vol. 4, P.R.O., *Sheriffs, Lists and Indexes*; C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 535-580)

- * Roger Appleton of Dartford, Kent (d. 1491), officer at Eltham, Kent under Edward IV, P.R.O., E 404 28/92/14; customer of Sandwich, J.P. Kent (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29 .
- * John Apsley, of Michelgrove, Sussex, lawyer, on all Sussex commissions (d. 1507); Richard Apsley, father or brother of the above of Thakeham, Sussex, was a serjeant-at-arms of Edward IV (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- * John Ashby of Herwick, Buckinghamshire, recently of Wythorn, Lincolnshire, recently of Tapleigh in the parish of Westleigh, Devon recently escheator for the king in Devon (perhaps clerk of the signet) (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * John Atwell of Exeter, Devon, merchant, collector in the port and town of Exeter and Dartmouth (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
- * Thomas Audley, servant of Edward IV, brother of John, Lord Audley; listed as a rebel; recently of Corfe, Dorset; esquire of body to Edward: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 299 (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1
- * Henry Auger of Newenden, Kent; sheriff of Kent in 1470 (April/May) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
- * William Bagot of Blythfield, Staffordshire; J.P. (28 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
- Thomas Beauchamp of Throckeleston, Hampshire and 'Chelchehyth', Middlesex (March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * John Beaufitz of Balsall, Warwickshire (d. 1489) recently receiver of Kenilworth, Warwickshire, and of all castles, manors etc of Alice, Lady Lovell and of Edward IV, 'recently king'; J.P. Warwickshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
- Thomas Beaumont of Poucheston, Wemberleigh and Exeter, Devon (11 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * Edward Berkeley, brother of Sir William of Beverston, of Avon, Wiltshire, (d. 1506); recently sheriff 'for the king' in Hampshire (1464, 1471, 1475, 1480); J.P. Hampshire (c. 27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- * William Beselles of Besselsleigh, Berkshire, J.P. 1483, removed after rising (25 June) P.R.O., C67/61/28.
- * John Biconell of South Perrot, Dorset, sheriff Somerset/Dorset, 1472; J.P. Somerset (20 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- * William Bird of London, officer of Edward IV (5 May) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
- * Jacques Blondell alias James Blondell of Welles, Suffolk, recently of Blo' Norton, Norfolk, recently of Wingfield, Suffolk, recently of Ewelme, Oxfordshire (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20; see also P.R.O., C67/51/33 (12 March) where Blondell is also given as of Westthorp, Sussex; see P.R.O., Prob. 11/11, fos. 93r-94v for the will of Jacques Blondell a servant of Edward IV, the duke of Suffolk, the Wingfields and more; also cofferer of the household under Edward IV, P.R.O., E 404/77/3/20.

- * James Blount esquire of the body to Edward IV and Richard III, of Tutbuty and Barton Blount, Staffordshire (d. 1493), captain of Hammes Castle; a Hastings retainer and brother of Lord Mountjoy (1 May, 1484) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * Thomas Blount of Kinlet, Shropshire, and Burton on Trent: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 185; esquire of the body by November, 1484; recently sheriff for King Edward; J.P. Lincolnshire; grant of 20 marks his only patronage from Richard III (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18).
- John Bonville of Shute, Devon, recently of Halsenate, Sussex (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
- * Henry Botfish mayor and escheator of Calais (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- * Robert Brackenbury of Selaby, Durham; of Gloucester's affinity: C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 650; an esquire then a knight of the body under Richard III: B.L.H.M., Vol.4, p. 24; sheriff of Kent, P.R.O., E 404/78/3/23, constable of the Tower, P.R.O., E 404/78/3/46; died at Bosworth (March) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * Edward Brampton of London, ambassador to Portugal and merchant, P.R.O., E 404/78/3/47; collector of the ulnage and subsidy for Edward IV in Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Canterbury and Huntingdonshire; esquire of the body to Edward by 1482: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 318, and of Richard by March 1484, *ibid.*, p. 416; according to B.L.H.M., Vol. 4, p. 25, also a knight of the body (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * John Brocas recently of Beaurepaire and Slyburn, Hampshire, son and heir of William Brocas; sheriff of Hampshire in 1481; J.P. Surrey; king's servant (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- John Brokeman of Witham, Essex, recently of London (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Richard Brome of Baddurley Clinton, Warwickshire (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * Richard Bronde, fishmonger of London also king's servant of Hertfordshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- * Anthony Brown of Betchworth, Surrey, (d.1506) alias of London, recently escheator in Somerset and Dorset (brother of Sir George Brown, executed, 1483) (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- * Thomas Brown (son and heir of Sir Henry Brown recently sheriff of Hampshire, 1458) of South Wokington, Essex, recently of Bekyngnam Kent (a manor held by Sir William Brandon: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 550), recently of Rymmer and Forthyngbrigge, Hampshire, recently of London (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
- * Drew Brudenall of Amersham, Buckinghamshire (d. 1491); sheriff of Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire, (1482) P.R.O., E 404/77/3/100 (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- * John Bruin recently of Stapleford, Cheshire, recently bailiff of the town of Flint (April?) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- Thomas Bulkeley of Ayton and Daneham, Cheshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- William Bulkeley of Wheatcroft and Cheadle Bulkeley, Cheshire and Beaumaris, North Wales (d. 1488/9) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- Henry Burnell of Poyntington, Somerset (c. 24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- Robert Calverley of Broxstowe and Bareford, Nottinghamshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
- * Thomas Calwoodley of Calverleigh, Devon, recently of Exeter, Devon, feodary in Devon (March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- * George Capelle recently of Houghcable, Hereford, recently of Gloucestershire, recently escheator in Worcester (4 May) P.R.O., C67/61/17.
- * John Carlisle of Newborn, Northumberland recently of Newcastle upon Tyne, merchant, collector for Edward IV (8 June) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
- * John Cartington of Cartington, Northumberland, recently collector of the customs and subsidies for King Edward in Newcastle; M.P. Northumberland (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * Richard Chamberlain of Shirburn, Oxfordshire, son of William of Northampton, recently escheator for Edward IV in Oxfordshire and Berkshire, recently of Westminster, and Sybil his wife, daughter of Richard Fowler, esquire (29 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
- * John Choke (and Elizabeth his wife) a lawyer, of 'Randolneston', Dorset (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- William Clayton of Yenett, Somerset (14 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * William Clopton of Long Melford, Kentwell and Denstow, Suffolk, (d. 1497), collector for Edward IV in Essex and Hertfordshire (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

- * Christopher Colyns esquire of the body under Edward IV: *Archaeologia* I, p. 350; draper and collector of the subsidy in London under Edward IV and Richard III: P.R.O., E 404/77/3/29, E 404/77/3/54, E 404/78/2/44; listed as king's servant under Richard III (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
- * Thomas Combes, of Pulborough, Sussex, (d. 1494) collector with Roger Kelsale in the port of Southampton, P.R.O., E 404/77/3/45; J.P. Sussex; clerk of the exchequer, M.P. Bletchingly, 1467-8 (in the Staffords' gift); sheriff of Surrey/Sussex (1478-9); J.P. 1481-5 (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- * Avery Cornburgh (d. 1487) of Bere Ferrers, Devon and of Dovers, Essex; yeoman of the crown and chamber, 1455-74; esquire of the body and sea-captain, 1474-85; M.P. Cornwall and Plymouth; J.P. Cornwall; sheriff of Cornwall (1464-5, 1468-9); J.P. Essex from 1468; sheriff of Essex and Hertfordshire (1472-3, 1477-8); usher of the chamber by 1474; esquire of the body by 1475 (2 July): *Wedgwood*.
- * John Courtenay, usher of the chamber to Edward by 1474; of Exminster and Kenn, Devon; brother of William and Philip; esquire of the body to Richard: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 428.
- * Richard Croft junior, of Woodstock and Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire (d. 1501); recently receiver for Edward IV in Herefordshire; M.P. Oxfordshire, 1472-5; esquire of the body to Richard III by June 1484 (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
- * Thomas Croft, of London and Bristol, (d. 1488), lawyer and king's servant, collector of customs and subsidies for Edward IV in the port and town of Bristol; J.P. Oxfordshire, lost commission after Richard's accession; reputed to have joined Henry Tudor before Bosworth (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
- * Robert Croke of Rodmarton, Gloucestershire, recently escheator in Gloucestershire and the March of Wales (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
- * Richard Culpepper senior, of West Peckam and Ditton, Kent (d. October, 1484); sheriff of Kent, 1471 (March?) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- John Dale of South Tunworth, Hampshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- * Constantine Darell of Collingbourne Abbas, Wiltshire (d. 1508) and Joanne his wife, daughter and heiress of William Chamberlain; a younger son of Sir William Darell of Capel, Kent; appointed 'troner and peseur' of Lynn, Norfolk (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- * Edward Darell, recently of Hulcote, Wiltshire, son and heir of George Darell, knight, recently sheriff of Edward, king of England (1460, 1464, 1468) (8 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.
- David ap Guillin Morgan of Arkeston, recently of Clehonger, Herefordshire, gentleman usher of the chamber, October, 1484: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 485 (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
- * Walter Dennis of Dyston, Gloucestershire, recently of Beddington, Surrey, recently sheriff of Surrey/Sussex, (1461) recently sheriff of Gloucester, (1479) recently escheator in Gloucester and the March of Wales, recently of London (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
- * William Druell of Clothall, Hertfordshire (d. 1485); J.P. Hertfordshire, removed after the rebellion (March) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * John Dudley, recently of Arundel and Atherington, Sussex; the second son of Lord Dudley; sheriff of Surrey/Sussex, 1483; J.P. Sussex, removed after the rising (c. 27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- * Thomas Durham of Great Kimbell, Buckinghamshire, collector for Edward IV in Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- Richard Drewell (Durnell) of Exeter, Devon, recently of Stoke Canon, Devon...alias merchant (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- Thomas Entwistle of Noseley, Leicestershire (April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * Everard Fielding of Littleworth, Leicestershire; J.P. Leicestershire (d. 1515) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * John Forster of Ware, Hertfordshire, recently of London, recently of Oxfordshire; sheriff of Cambridgeshire/Huntingdonshire (1466) and of Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire (1467); J.P. Hertfordshire, removed after the rising (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- * John Fortescue esquire of the body to Edward IV by 1476; nephew of the chief justice and of Thomas Montgomery; councillor, gentleman porter of Calais, of London and of Ponsbourne, Hertfordshire; sheriff of Essex (1481) P.R.O., E 404/77/2/20, and Cornwall (1470, and from 1471-6) (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

- * Thomas Foulehurst of Crewe, Cheshire, son of Sir Robert; constable of Crewe (May, 1483) and usher of the chamber (September, 1483) (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
- * Thomas Fowler, gentleman usher of the chamber under Edward IV, C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 96 and yeoman of the crown, 1472-5; esquire of the body to Richard, *ibid.*, 1476-85, p. 411 (according to *Wedgwood*, esquire of the body, 1475-85); of Buckingham (d. 1496); sheriff of Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire (1478, 1483); J.P. Buckinghamshire, removed after the rising (5 April) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- Jacob Frampton recently of Morton, Dorset (March) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
- Thomas Green of Witham, Essex (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
- John Griffen of Braybroke, Northamptonshire (20 April) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- * William Griffith of Penryhn, Carnarvon, North Wales, chamberlain of North Wales (4 April) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- William Haket (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- Robert Halley alias Hawley of Whitting, Northamptonshire, alias of Middlesey, Canterbury (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * Edward Hardgill of Mere, Wiltshire; yeoman of the crown and then usher of the chamber to Edward IV: *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, p. 87; C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 57; C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 10; yeoman of the crown by February 1484 *ibid.*, no 1083; sheriff of Wiltshire (1476, November, 1483); sheriff of Hampshire (1477); sheriff Somerset/Dorset (1479); porter of Freemantle, 1461-85; J.P. (March) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- Thomas Harowden of Northamptonshire (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- * William Harper of Rushall, Staffordshire (d. 1508); steward of the duke of Buckingham; J.P. Staffordshire, removed after the rising (c 25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- * James Haute of London and of Bishopsbourne, Kent (d. 1505); king's servant and esquire of the body of Edward IV: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 169 (May) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
- * Thomas Hoo of Roffey, Sussex; J.P. temp Edward IV and Richard III (12 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.
- Gervase Horne of Appledore, Kent (d. 1493) (February 23) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- Henry Horne of Kennerton, also of Appledore and Leneham, Kent (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * John Hugford (Higford) of Edmescote, Warwickshire (d. 1485); an esquire of the body by 1482, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 319; sheriff of Warwickshire/Leicestershire (1464); sheriff of Gloucestershire (1465) (28 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
- * John Huggins (Higgons d. 1500) of Whitestaunton, Somerset, lawyer; J.P. Somerset and of the quorum, 1479-May, 1483, when removed (May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- * Henry Hull of West Larkbere, Ashill and Exeter, Devon; M.P. Exeter (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * John Kilnington of East Dereham, Norfolk and of London, official of Etheldrede of Ely, hundred of Mitford, Norfolk (4 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * William La Donnhale of Gedington, Northamptonshire, recently collector for Edward IV in Northamptonshire, recently of Aintell, Bedfordshire (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- * Thomas Langford of Bradford, Berkshire, son and heir of Edward Langford esquire; collector of the customs and subsidy in the port of Southampton (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- * Henry Langley of Rickling, Essex and of Hertfordshire; J.P. in Cambridgeshire for Edward IV, removed after Edward's death; sheriff of Essex/Hertfordshire (1475) (c. 10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- * Richard Lee of Quarrendon, Buckinghamshire, of London alias of Maidstone, recently J.P. for the king (Kent - removed temporarily after July, 1483), yeoman of the crown (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Robert Legh of Adlington and Butley, Cheshire and Rolston, Nottinghamshire (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- Roland Lenthall of London and of Hampton Court, Herefordshire ((March) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
- * John Lewes recently collector of the customs and subsidy in the county of Northumberland; serjeant-at-arms under Edward IV and Richard III (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- * Humphrey Littlebury of Kirton in Holland, Lincolnshire (d. 1486), gentleman usher of the chamber in March 1484: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 454 (March) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * Robert Lovet of Astwell, Northamptonshire and Anna his wife, daughter and heiress of Richard Drayton; recently escheator in the counties of Northamptonshire and Rochester, recently sheriff of Northamptonshire, (1481) (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

- * John Luthington, king's esquire of Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, and of London, recently bailiff, and receiver of the duke of Clarence's lands in Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire and Essex (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 - * Thomas Lygon of Madrefield, Wales and Worcester; receiver for King Edward; perhaps J.P. Essex; M.P. Worcestershire, 1467-8, 1470-1, 1472-5 and January, 1483; solicitor for the king (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 - * Gilbert Manners, recently of Crall, Northumberland; 'recently collector of the customs and subsidies for the son of King Edward, recently king'; brother of Sir Robert of Etal, Northumberland, king's servant (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- John Marlborough senior of London and Norwich (c. 25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
 John Marvin of Fonthill Gifford, recently of Heytesbury, Wiltshire (18 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
- * Thomas Mauncelle, of East Garston, Berkshire, recently escheator for Edward in Somerset and Dorset, alias of London, supervisor of all the king's castles in Somerset and Dorset (7 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
- Milo ap Henry recently of Coblynton, Herefordshire, recently of Newport, March of Wales (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
- John Mitton of Lichfield, Staffordshire (28 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 Thomas Molineux (d. 1506) of Coton and Houghton, Nottinghamshire and Lancashire (4 May) Wedgwood.
- * John Mompesson of Bathampton, Wiltshire; J.P. in Wiltshire and sheriff there (1477, 1481) (23 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 - * Richard Mynors of St Waynard's in Archenfield, Herefordshire (d. 1528); usher of the chamber under Richard III by November 1484: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 516; steward of the king's commotes in Cardigan and Cantremaure; see Griffiths, 'Principality of Wales', p. 160 (March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
- Jacob Necham of Mylneston and Hundesmore, Somerset (May/June) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- * John Newburgh of East Lulworth, Dorset and of London; J.P. for Edward IV, removed by Richard (14 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 - * Thomas Oxenbridge, a lawyer of Beckley, Sussex; J.P. for Edward IV in Sussex (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 - * John Paston, recently of Norwich, recently of Caister and Waynesthorp, Norfolk , recently of London; J.P. for Edward IV in Norfolk (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 - * Peter Peckam of London, mercer of London, customer for Edward IV in the port of London (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 - * Robert Pemberton of Rushden and Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire, recently of London; J.P. for Edward IV in Northamptonshire, removed after Richard's accession ; an usher of the chamber under Edward: C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 590 (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 - * John Penley of Culpho, Suffolk, yeoman of the chamber to Edward IV: C.P.R., 1467-77, p. 263; gentleman usher of the chamber to Richard III: B.L.H.M; recently escheator for King Edward in Norfolk and Suffolk, Essex and Hertfordshire and receiver for Edward IV in those counties (18 May) P.R.O., C67/51/37.
 - * John Pilton (d. 1495) of Rockingham, Drayton and Harringworth, Northamptonshire; offices under Edward IV in Drayton; sheriff of Rutland (1473, 1478, 1484); king's servant (8 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.
- Richard Pole esquire of the body under Richard III, of Coates, Gloucestershire, of London and recently of Eastwynche, Norfolk; J.P. in Gloucester and Norfolk, sheriff of Norfolk/Suffolk in 1484 (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * Richard Portington of Portington, Yorkshire, recently of Sawcliff, Lincolnshire, recently escheator for King Edward IV in Yorkshire (8 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.
- Humphrey Poyntz of Womberleigh and Langlegh, Devon (11 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
- * Robert Poyntz recently of Iron Acton and Lylle, Gloucestershire, recently sheriff of Gloucestershire (1468, 1476, 1481) and Hampshire [1482] for Edward IV; esquire of the body to Edward; recently of Beaulieu, Hampshire (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
 - * John Risley esquire of the body, Lavenham, Suffolk, recently collector of rents in Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex and Hertfordshire, alias of London (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

- * Henry Roos of Dennington, Suffolk, recently of Buckenham Castle, Norfolk; Berwick office under Edward IV (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- Richard Roos of Hackford, Norfolk, alias of London (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- * John Rotherham of Somereyse, Bedfordshire, recently of Canterbury; J.P. for Edward in Bedfordshire; sheriff of Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire (1476) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- John St John senior, of Westbury, Northamptonshire; recently son and heir of Margaret, recently duchess of Somerset (10 March), P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- * Bartholomew St Leger of Yolston, Devon and of London (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- * Jacob St Leger of West Malling, Kent (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- * Thomas Salesbury recently of Flint, constable of Denbigh (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- * Richard Salkeld, esquire of the body of Corkby, Cumberland; sheriff of Cumberland, 1457, 1461, 1465, 1470, 1483 (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- * John Sapcote, esquire of the body by 1480, of Alyngton and Elton, Huntingdonshire, alias of Bampton and Tavistock, Devon, alias of London; (brother-in-law of John, Lord Dinham, C.C.R., 1476-85, no. 1227), sheriff of Devon, 1477; J.P. Devon and Huntingdonshire, lost commission in Devon in May, 1483; sheriff of Rutland (1475-6) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- * William Sapcote, usher of the chamber by March, 1484: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 428, of Thornhaugh, Northamptonshire; attainted after Bosworth (25 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * John Scarisbrick of Lancashire, recently collector with John Molineux (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
- John Scrope recently of Castlecombe, Wiltshire, Oxenton and Berkeley, Gloucestershire and Southampton (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
- * John Seymour of Wolf Hall in Grafton, Wiltshire (d. 1491); his father was sheriff of Wiltshire in 1457; J.P. in Wiltshire June and July 1483; perhaps kinsman of Sir John, sheriff of Hampshire in 1453 (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
- Ralph Shelton of Shelton, Norfolk and Brednally, Suffolk (7 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
- * Robert Shoreditch of 'Chelchelith', (probably Chelsea Old Church or Chelsea Christ Church) Middlesex, servant of king Edward (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- William Spence of Northamptonshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- * Humphrey Stafford of Grafton, Worcestershire, esquire for the body of Edward IV and Richard III, recently justice in Worcestershire and Shropshire, recently collector of the ulnage in Worcestershire and Herefordshire (3 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.
- Richard Stukeley of Ashton, Devon (11 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * John Sturgeon of Hitchin and Gatesby, Hertfordshire (d. 1492); royal receiver and keeper of the king's manors in Cornwall and Devon, Essex and Hertfordshire; alias usher of the chamber then esquire of the body and master of the ordnance under Edward IV by 1481: C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 14, 264; P.R.O., E 404/77/2/71; *Wedgwood* pp. 825-6 and *Somerville, op.cit.*, p. 593; given as esquire of the body to Richard, but no contemporary reference; sheriff of Essex (1479, 1483), P.R.O., E 404/78/2/9; sheriff of Cornwall (1467); J.P. Hertfordshire, removed after the rising (9 April) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- Thomas Surteys son and heir of the same of Dedynsale, and Northgosforth, Lincolnshire (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- John Sutton of Rye, Sussex, merchant (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
- Peter Sutton recently of Hatton, Cheshire, perhaps kinsman of Richard of Sutton, Cheshire, serjeant-at-law, see *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 193 (April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * Oliver Sutton of Drayton, Northamptonshire, receiver (3 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- * Edmund Talbot of East Retford and Kingston upon Hull, Nottinghamshire (d. 1496); recently customer of Hull and collector of the customs and subsidies for king Edward in Kingston-upon-Hull (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
- * John Tame of Fairford, Gloucestershire and of London, recently merchant of the Staple of Calais (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- Thomas Tropenell of Great Chalfield and Neston, Wiltshire; lawyer (23 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

- * John Twynyho of Cirencester, Gloucester (d. 1485), lawyer, and Buckingham's servant; recently customer for Edward IV in Gloucester; recently recorder of Bristol; J.P. for Edward in Gloucestershire, removed after the rising; M.P. Bristol and Gloucestershire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
 - * William Twynyho of Shipton Solers, Gloucestershire, Hayford, Somerset and Shaftsbury, Dorset; king's esquire, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 278; J.P. Dorset (d. 1497) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
 - * Thomas Tyrell of East Horndon, Essex, alias of Flyngoldshern, Essex; esquire of the body to Edward IV by 1478, C.P.R., 1476-85, p.135; recently sheriff of Essex and Hertfordshire (1480) and J.P. in Essex (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20 and P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 - * Thomas Unwin recently king's escheator in Hampshire and Wiltshire (May?) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- William Venables of Kinderton, Cheshire (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- * John Wake of Great Broughton and Great Staunton, Huntingdon; gentleman usher by October, 1481, C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 514; sheriff and J.P. of Cambridge P.R.O., E 404/78/2/19; J.P. Huntingdonshire, removed after the rising; according to *Wedgwood* an usher of the chamber, 1484-5 (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- John Waller of Groombridge, Kent (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- * William Walrond of Chalfield and Monkton Farleigh, Wiltshire, and of London (d. 1501), servant of Edward IV (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 - * John Walsh of Olveston, Gloucestershire and Newark, Nottinghamshire; recently feodary for the king and collector of the customs and subsidies in Bristol; formerly auditor in North Wales (February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
 - * Thomas Wellesbourne of Chepping Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, yeoman of the chamber, 1476-80; keeper of Woodstock, 1476-80: *Wedgwood* (March).
 - * William Weston of Surrey and Sussex, collector of the customs and subsidy, London (25 March), P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- Robert Whitney of Whitney, March of Wales, recently of Hereford (c. 6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- * John Wikes of Dodington, Woldsland and Dursley, Gloucestershire, and of Stanton, Somerset; esquire of the body of Edward IV; J.P. for Edward in Gloucestershire, removed after the rising; (d. 1485); son and heir of Thomas Wikes (May) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
 - * Henry Willoughby of Middleton, Warwickshire and Woollaton, Nottinghamshire (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 - * Ralph Willoughby of Raveningham, Norfolk, esquire of the body by March, 1484 sheriff of Norfolk, 6 November, 1483, J.P. Suffolk, removed after the rising (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 - * Edward Wingfield of Letheringham, Suffolk, and of the quorum (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 - * William Wingfield of Letheringham, Suffolk (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 - * Thomas Windsor, lawyer of Stanwell, Middlesex and of West Hagbourne, Berkshire; usher of the chamber, 1483-5; constable of Windsor, 1484-5 (and earlier) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/
- John Wirthill of London (24 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * Guy Wolston, recently of Apethorpe, Northamptonshire, and of London (d. 1504), esquire of the body to Edward IV: C.P.R., 1476-85, p. 172 (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 - * John Wood (d. 1485) recently of Molesey, Surrey, brother of Sir John of Molesey, recently of Rivers Hall, Sussex, recently of Essex and Hertfordshire; keeper of the coinage and warden of the mint; sheriff of Essex/Hertfordshire (1478) J.P. Sussex (6 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 - * Thomas Woodhouse of Kimberley, Norfolk, recently escheator for Edward IV in Norfolk (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- Thomas Wyndeford of Shadwell, Middlesex (13 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
- * Thomas Young of Bristol, recently of Tormanton and Shirehampton, Gloucester and of London; son and heir of Thomas Young, recently justice for King Edward IV (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/25.

GENTLEMEN

(For all references except where indicated, see *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, and *Wedgwood*.)

- * John Alday merchant and grocer of London; of Ash, Kent and London; victualler of the fleet, 1461-3; M.P. Sandwich (d. 1494) (7 May) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
- * John Anstey of Sturry, Canterbury, recently escheator for Edward IV; sheriff of Cambridgeshire/Huntingdonshire (1471) (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
- * William Apsley of Thakenham, Sussex, recently of Arundel, Sussex; Richard, father or brother was serjeant at arms of Edward IV (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- Michael Ardys of Sherington, Buckinghamshire (23 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- Henry Ashbourne of London (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- William Aubrey of Emere, Buckinghamshire and of London (May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
- James Audley alias James Tuchet (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
- Robert Auger of Westwell, Kent (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
- George Bainbridge of Heyshere, Sussex, recently of Trotton, Sussex (Sir Thomas Lewkenor's seat) (May?) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
- * John Baker of Lamport Estoner, Somerset alias John Elys, recently collector of the customs and subsidies in the port of Bridgwater (April/May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
- William Baker of Devizes, Wiltshire, alias of Wells, Somerset, recently of London (1 June) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- Henry Balfort of Carnarvon, North Wales (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- Thomas Barton of Weobley, Herefordshire (where Buckingham remained for some days after his abortive revolt), recently of Ashton near Kinglane, Herefordshire, recently of London (7 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
- * John Basset of Croydon, Surrey, recently constable of the castle of..., recently of London (5 March) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- Richard Bedell of Writtle, Essex, (Buckingham's seat), of London and of Holborne, Middlesex (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- Patrick Bedlowe of Buckland Brewer, Devon; son and heir of John recently of Allington, Devon, recently of London (May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- * John Belle of London and of Leatherhead, Surrey, cofferer of the household and former clerk of John Elrington in the reign of King Edward; (perhaps the bailiff of Cambridge who assisted Richard III in his journey south to meet the rebels; although there appear to be namesakes: a John Belle was also clerk of the countinghouse, and chief 'winedrawer'; another, if not the above was king's servitor, one of the marshals of the king's hall, and Robert, his son, groom of the king's chamber: *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, pp. 235, 249) (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
- Peter Bennett recently of Cornwall and Devon (1 June) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * Edward Bohun of London, alias of Fressingfield, Suffolk, collector of the fifteenths and tenths in Norfolk and Suffolk (May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- Thomas Bonde of Ertle, Cornwall (February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- John Bonville of Dodington and Dinnington, Somerset (16 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- John Borough of Lyme Regis, Dorset (10 June) P.R.O., C67/51/32.
- * Thomas Brandon of Wenham, Suffolk, recently of Southwark, Surrey, recently of London (attainted rebel and son of Sir William Brandon allegedly in Brittany with Henry Tudor and his brother, William; Thomas Brandon also received a pardon in January, 1485: *C.P.R.*, 1476-85, p. 526) (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- * Robert Bradbury of Littlebury, Essex (d. 1489) servant of Edward IV (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- * Thomas Bradley of Bristol, merchant, customer of Poole, Dorset (20 October) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
- * Reginald Bray (d. 1503) recently of London, recently of Harting, Sussex, recently of Woking, Surrey (residence of Margaret Beaufort) (duchy of Lancaster position) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

- * Thomas Braynton of Hereford, recently escheator for Edward IV in Hereford and the March of Wales (d. 1494) (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
- * Roger Brent of Canterbury, alias of London, (listed as a rebel) recently escheator in Canterbury, recently alderman of Canterbury and justice in the county of Kent (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/3.
- * William Brent of Lamport Estoner, Somerset (probably a kinsman of the above and Robert Brent, attainted yeoman of the crown of Wyvelsburgh, Kent) (5 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
- Richard Brian of London, recently of Bledlow, Buckinghamshire, recently of Bensington, Oxfordshire (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
- Jacob Brice of Baulking, Berkshire and of London; probably kinsman of Hugh Brice, clerk of the mint, goldsmith and merchant of London (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- William Bristowe of Coventry, merchant of Warwickshire (d. 1484) (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- John Brode junior of Maidstone, Mersham, Ilcombe, Sundridge, and Charing, Kent, recently of London (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Ralph Bromiche, recently of Samefeld Coffyn, Herefordshire (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
- * John Brown of London, officer for the king with Richard Woodward (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
- * John Brown of London, recently alderman of London and escheator for Edward IV (11 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
- John Brusy recently of ... Cornwall (19 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- Arthur Bulkeley of Aston, Cheshire (19 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * Hugh Bulkeley (lost office under Richard) probably the fourth son of William of Cheadle Bulkeley, Cheshire; of London (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
- Robert Bulkeley of 'Forthyngbrigge', Hampshire (18 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
- * William Bury of Whitchurch, Hampshire, petty customer (13 May) P.R.O., C67/51/32.
- Benedict Caldwell of Ipswich, Suffolk and of Southwark, Surrey; lawyer (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- Stephen Calmady of Tenant, Cornwall, recently of Launceston in the parish of St Vuy, merchant (June/July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.
- Thomas Calverly of Calverley, Exeter; lawyer, J.P. Devon (February): *Wedgwood*, p. 150.
- * William Castleton recently of Long Ditton, Surrey, undersheriff (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Richard Chadok of Snaith, Yorkshire, and of London (5 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
- John Chamber recently of Lewes and Laughton, Sussex (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- Henry Champeney of Frome Selwood, Somerset (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- Thomas Champeney of Frome Selwood, Somerset (d.1505), of London, son and heir of Henry (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * Alexander Cheyney of Great Shefford, Berkshire, recently of London (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- * Richard Clerk of Exeter, lawyer and merchant; bailiff of Exeter in 1470; escheator in Devon and Cornwall; J.P. Devon and of the quorum (12 March): *Wedgwood*, p. 191.
- Christopher Clifford recently of Bobbing, Kent (22 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Thomas Clifford, of Farle, Hampshire and Boscombe, Wiltshire (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- * John Clineston recently escheator for the king in Norfolk and Suffolk, recently of Debenham, Suffolk (22 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * John Clopton of Long Melford, Suffolk and of London (probably the John Clopton esquire of Kentwell, Suffolk d. 1497, father of William esquire, and listed as such himself) recently sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk (1451, 1455) (May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
- * Philip Cokland recently of Lincoln, recently collector of the customs and subsidies for Edward IV in the port and town of Bristol (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
- Henry Colan recently of Colan, Cornwall and St Winnow, Cornwall (29 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
- Hugh Coledale of Cumberland and Yorkshire, recently of Fangeston, Wiltshire (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
- * John Copleston recently of Mithian, Cornwall and of Plymouth, Devon, constable of the gaol, recently of Buketon and Dykton, Devon (23 June) P.R.O., C67/51/30.

- * William Croke of London, collector in the port and town of Calais (5 March) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- Edward Culpepper of Aylesford, Kent (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- William Culpepper of Aylesford, Kent (2 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
- * Peter Curtis, of Kirby and Leicester, and of Kingston on Thames, recently of London, recently collector of the subsidy in the port of London (keeper of the great wardrobe, 1472-94 although temporarily lost this position in September, 1483) (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- William Daker of Durnstaple, Bedfordshire (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- * Richard Danvers of Prescot, Oxfordshire, recently collector of the subsidy in the port and town of London, recently controller in the port of London (March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- * Robert Darell of Audener and Wilton, Southampton, recently escheator in Southampton and Wiltshire (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
- Thomas Darnell of London, recently of Springthorp, Lincoln (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- David Lloyd ap Jenkins of Pembrokeshire, Wales, and of London (perhaps officer at Pontefract) (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- * John Denton of Shurford, Warwickshire, recently of Whitham, Berkshire, (seat of Sir Richard Harcourt) recently of London; J.P. Berkshire, removed after the rising (23 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * John Denys of Orlegh, Devon; J.P. Devon, removed after rising (May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- William Dollyng of Calais, recently of London, notary (29 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- Galfrido Dommyo of Savesdon, Canterbury (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
- William Durmpstede, mercer of London, recently of Lyme, Dorset (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
- * John Dymmock of Friskney, Lincolnshire; deputy receiver, recently of London; J.P. Lincolnshire but removed after the rising for the parts of Lindsey (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- Richard Dyneley recently of Silchester, Southampton, recently of Caversham, Oxfordshire, recently of Stanford, Berkshire of London (3 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Christopher Elkonhede of London, and Calais (20 August).
- * Richard Erlegh of Fontell and Hackam, Wiltshire, and of Maiden Erlegh, Berkshire, recently of London; M.P. Chippenham, 1467-8 and Heytesbury, 1472-5 (seat of the Hungerfords) (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
- William Estoste of Redenes and Mershland, Yorkshire (8 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.
- * John Fineux of Faversham, Kent (d. c. 1527) a justice of the works, and of the quorum, councillor (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
- * John Fitzherbert of Etwall, Derbyshire (d. 1503) and of London; king's remembrancer, oppositor, receiver and collector of customs and subsidies in the port of London (5 March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
- * John Flasby of Poole, Dorset (Buckingham's servant), of London, recently collector of the customs and subsidies in the town and port of Poole, recently of Upton (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- William Fontnell of Langford Leceister, Devon, recently of London (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
- Richard Forde of Penshurst (Buckingham's seat), recently of Stike, Kent (5 May) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
- * Robert Forster of London, and of Enfield, Middlesex; lawyer, king's stationer, 1471-83, customer (11 March); J.P. Middlesex P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- * William Fowler of Buckingham in Buckinghamshire (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- * William Gate son and heir of Geoffrey Gate, knight, receiver and sheriff in Southampton (1465) (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- * Richard Gaynesford of Lyngfeld, Surrey (5 May) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- Henry Gillet of Helstonborough, Cornwall (5 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.
- Richard Glyn of Parva Glyn, Cornwall (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/3.
- John Gonnace of Hayton, Yorkshire, alias recently of London (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
- Richard Gosse recently of Ipswich, Suffolk (March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- Anthony Grakenthorp (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
- Thomas Grey recently of Lyddenay, Gloucestershire and Monyngton, Hereford (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
- William Gunter recently of Audener, Southampton (22 June) P.R.O., C67/51/32.

Thomas Hall of Trowbridge, Wiltshire, recently of Mere, Wiltshire, recently of Henton near Stappleashton, of London (8 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.

Walter Hall of Nethershanon, Derbyshire (7 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

Nicholas Halwell recently of London, and of Halwell in the parish of Gotehurst, Somerset, son and heir of Robert Halwell, probably kinsman of attainted rebel John Halwell; recently received a licence of medicine at the college of Oxford (14 April) P.R.O., C67/51/16.

William Harding recently of Durley, Somerset (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.

- * Richard Harper of White Roding, Essex, (former servant of Buckingham) recently escheator for Edward IV in Essex and Hertfordshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
- * John Hayes of More End and Tiverton, Devon, recently receiver of Edward IV in Devon, Somerset, Cornwall, Dorset, Hampshire and Wiltshire, alias of Wilton, Wiltshire (June) C667/51/34.
- * Thomas Hazlewood, recently escheator for Edward IV in Northampton and Rochester (June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

William Head recently of Marsden (Woodville estate formerly managed by Sir George Brown) Plukley and Ealding, Kent and of London (23 February) P.R.O., C67/61/27.

John Helsham of Headcorm, Kent, recently of Goudhurst, Kent, (Alexander Culpepper's seat) recently of Rolvenden, Kent (Guildford's seat) (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Henry ap Watkyn recently of Donnington in Herefordshire (April/May) P.R.O., C67/51/25.

- * John Heron of Langport Estoner, Somerset (attainted rebel), recently customer of the town of Bridgwater, recently attorney (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.

Henry Hole of Okehampton, Devon (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.

Allan Holt of London and Bandfield, Essex (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

Richard Holt of Bingham, Nottinghamshire (perhaps the servant of Brian Stapleton) (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

- * John Horde of Shrewsbury and Walford, Shropshire, recently of Bridgnorth, Shropshire (a Stafford residence used by Margaret Beaufort); J.P. Shropshire; lawyer, M.P. Bridgnorth, 1470-1; steward of Lord Strange, and after his death, according to *Wedgwood*, p. 468, Horde served the Stanleys (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

Richard Howel of Stalbridge, Dorset (6 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.

John Ipping mercer of London alias of Inton, Bedfordshire (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Isley of Sunridge, Kent, listed as a rebel (February): *Wedgwood*.

Edmund Jenney of Knodishall, recently of Theberton, Suffolk, and of London (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John ap Meredydd ap Jenkin of Rowdedor and Balla in the county of Penlyn, Wales (13 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

William Jope of Horsted Keynes and East Grinstead, Sussex (February 25) P.R.O., C67/51/8.

- * Thomas Kebell of Humberstone, Leicestershire (d. 1500) attorney general of the duchy of Lancaster; J.P. Leicestershire (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

Thomas Kebell, feoffee of the manors, lands and tenements of William Hastings, knight, recently William, Lord Hastings (24 June) P.R.O., C67/51/30.

John Kentwood son and heir of Robert Kentwood of West Shifford, Berkshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

- * Morgan Kidwelly of Langton, Dorset, alias of London (d. 1505; attorney of the duke of Gloucester; attorney-general under Richard III); under Edward IV supervisor of all castles, lordships and manors in Somerset, Dorset, Devon and Cornwall and receiver of the same (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

Thomas Kneesworth fishmonger and merchant of London, alias of Kneesworth, Canterbury, Kent (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

- * William Knolles of Samford Orskeys, Somerset recently appointed to supervise all manors and tenements formerly the possession of George, duke of Clarence and Richard, earl of Warwick in the county of Somerset and the town of Bristol; recently escheator in Somerset and Dorset, recently of London (May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Kylham of Petersburg, Norwich (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

- * John Kymer recently of Bristol, mercer, (Buckingham's servant) recently of Poole, Dorset, with John Walsh and Thomas Croft recently collector of the customs and subsidies in Bristol and Poole (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

William Lacy of Westminster, Middlesex (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

* John Langford of Sodbury, Gloucestershire, alias of Bristol, merchant (6 July) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

* Edmund Langley of Sudyngton Langley, Gloucestershire, recently escheator for the King of England in Gloucestershire and the March of Wales (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.

* Richard Lathel of London, and of Cray St Mary, Kent, 'jugiossator' (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

* John Lee of Addington, Surrey; a yeoman of the crown, 1475-83; M.P. Plympton and granted this bailiwick with Peter Curtis, before Edward's death (10 March) 67/51/19.

* John Lemyngton of London and of Calais, merchant of the Staple of Calais (14 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

* Hugo Lewys alias Hugo ap Hulkyn of the county of Anglesey in North Wales, recently undersheriff of Anglesey (March/April) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

John ap Howell recently of Onerton, Flint (29 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

John Loveday of Chester, Suffolk (perhaps a kinsman of attainted yeoman William Loveday of Pulham, Norfolk) (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

* Nicholas Lowe of St Winnow, Cornwall, receiver of the duke of Clarence's lands in Devon and Cornwall (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

Richard Lynstead of Norwich (9 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.

Thomas Milbery of Middlesex, recently of Newton Bushel, Devon, alias of Intewode, Norfolk, alias of Walkern, Hertfordshire, alias of Southwerk, Surrey (29 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

* John More of Colyton, Devon, recently of Exeter, Devon; J.P. Devon (18 June) P.R.O., C67/51/30.

* Richard More of Burghfield, Berkshire, recently supervisor of the subsidy and ulnage for Devon, Cornwall, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Somerset, Dorset, Wiltshire and Hampshire; supervisor of the subsidy and ulnage in the counties aforesaid and within the counties of Surrey, Sussex, Gloucestershire and in the town of Bristol; supervisor of the buying of victuals (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/3.

* Richard Morton recently of London, recently of Milbourne St Andrews, Dorset, (brother of John Morton, bishop of Ely (February 1484); J.P. Dorset; sheriff of Somerset/Dorset, where listed as an esquire (1481) P.R.O., C67/51/3.

* Robert Morton of London, recently keeper of the King's park in Canterbury (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

Thomas Morton recently of London (February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

* Robert Moton of St Brenellys in the forest of Deau, Gloucestershire, receiver for Edward IV of the Forest of Deau (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

* William Nicholson of Lynn, Norfolk and of London, merchant; M.P. Lynn 1472-5 (February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.

* John Norton of 'Southqeyke', Norfolk, alias merchant, alias deputy of Robert Braybroke (merchant of King's Lynn, Norfolk) recently of Lynn, recently customer for Edward IV in the town and port of Lynn, Norfolk (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

Robert Percelles recently of Riseley, Bedfordshire (4 June) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Robert Perham recently of Great Childerley in Canterbury, Kent (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.

Thomas Persons of Arnold and Chylwell, Nottinghamshire (1 June) P.R.O., C67/51/23.

John Pinchamony of Little Hautbois, Norfolk (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

* Robert Plomer of Sandon, Essex, recently of London, collector of the customs and subsidies in the port of London; J.P. Essex (February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

* Thomas Poyntz recently of Iron Acton and Hill, Gloucestershire, recently of London (May/June) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

* Philip Preston of Stafford, recently of London, recently escheator in Staffordshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.

John Probse of Chagforth, Devonshire (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

* John Quidhampton of Bramdean, Hampshire, recently keeper of the gaol and the castle of Wynton (June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

Richard Rediche of Cropenhale, Cheshire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

John Robinson senior of Boston, Lincolnshire, merchant (4 May) P.R.O., C67/51/23.

* John Rodon, son and heir of William Rodon; receiver of King Edward IV of Bromfield and Yale in the March of Wales (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

Thomas Roote of Maresfield, Sussex (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/23.

- * Brian Roucliff of Cowthorpe, Yorkshire, (d. 1494) baron of the exchequer (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

Richard Saxton recently of Rhuddlan in Flintshire (June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

- * Thomas Say of Abingdon, Berkshire, alias of London, recently an officer for the king; J.P. Berkshire (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

William Scot of Cheydon Mount and Stapleford Tanny, Essex (5 March) P.R.O., C67/51/28.

- * John Shelley of London, merchant, recently undersheriff of London (24 April) P.R.O., C67/51/18.

William Sheringham of St Albans, Hertfordshire (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

- * Stephen Shotton of London, recently of Burne, Lincoln and Carbrooke, Norfolk, recently escheator for Edward IV in the town of Lincoln (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
- * John Skinner of Reigate, Surrey and of London, recently undersheriff in Surrey and Sussex (May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
- * Richard Skynner of Peckham, Surrey, recently escheator for Edward IV in Surrey and Sussex (16 May) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
- * John Smyth of Maiden Newton and Askerskwel, Dorset and of London; yeoman of the chamber under Edward and confirmed in May 1483: C.P.R., 1476-85, pp. 43, 382 and P.R.O., E 404/78/1/3; escheator of Essex and Hertfordshire temp Edward IV (9 May) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
- * Thomas Snaresdon recently bailiff of the liberty of the bishop of Ely in the county of Canterbury alias of Linton, Canterbury and of Hadstoke, Essex (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Drew Stanburn of Southcote near Reading, Berkshire (6 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

- * William Stapelhill of Clifton Dartmouth, Devon, recently escheator in Devon and customer of Clifton Dartmouth, Devon (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

John Stepneth recently of Wallingford, Berkshire, alias John Smyth recently of St Albans, Herefordshire, recently of ... Northamptonshire, recently of Halcombe, Oxfordshire (19 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

Thomas Stourton of East Horsley, Surrey (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

- * William Strode of Folyngnam, Lincoln, recently of Trowbridge, Wiltshire, recently of Ashby de la Zouche, Leicester, yeoman of the crown, servant of Buckingham and Hastings; attainted 1484 (May/June) P.R.O., C67/51/30.

Ralph Sutton of Sutton, Cheshire (22 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

- * Richard Sutton of Sutton, Cheshire (serjeant-at-law) (April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
- * John Timperley esquire of the body of Edward IV of Hintlesham, Suffolk (d.1491), recently of London, recently of Ipswich, Suffolk, recently of the diocese of Ely, recently of Canterbury, Kent (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

Henry Toft, recently of London and of Baddow, Essex (18 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

John Tomlins of Lyford, Berkshire (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

- * Robert Topclyf of Coventry, officer in the town (perhaps kinsman of John Topclyf of Corringham, Lincolnshire) (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

John Trelawny of Menheniot and Bodromiok, Cornwall (July) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

John Tremayle of Taunton, Somerset and Sudbury, Devon (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

Christopher Tremayne of Tavistock and Gatecombe, Devon (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

Richard Vowell of Wells, Somerset and of Stalbridge, Dorset (6 July) *Wedgwood*.

- * Thomas Wade, recently of Calais, alias of London, recently collector of the customs for the King (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
- * John Walker of Southampton, merchant and of London; customer 1469-83, J.P. Hampshire (1 June): *Wedgwood*.
- * Thomas Walton, recently of Lathom, Lancashire, (residence of Lord Strange, son of Thomas Lord Stanley) recently escheator in Cheshire, recently of London (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- * William Wann recently of London, yeoman of the crown, of Denham and Eton, Buckinghamshire, recently escheator for Edward IV in Bedfordshire/Buckinghamshire (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
- * William Ward recently of London, recently of Olney and Eton, Buckinghamshire, recently escheator for Edward IV (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

William West of Portswood, Hampshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

John Westbroke of Godalming, Surrey, recently of Farnham, Surrey (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

Richard Whele recently of Westminster, recently of Finchingfield, Essex, alias Richard Pearson of Finchingfield, Essex (March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.

* Robert White of South Warnborough, Hampshire (probably the esquire of the same) son and heir of John White of Favisham, Surrey, recently collector of the subsidy and ulnage for Edward IV in Surrey (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

John Whitingham recently of London, recently of Aldbury, Herefordshire, of Weston Torvile and Great Kimble, Buckinghamshire (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

Robert Whitney of Whitney in the March of Wales alias of Hereford (February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

* Thomas Wimbish of Nocton, Lincolnshire (d. 1505), merchant of the Staple of Calais; sheriff of Linconshire (1474, as esquire); J.P. Lincolnshire (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

Robert Wolveden of Wolveden, Cornwall (8 June) P.R.O., C67/51/23.

John Wood (At Wood) recently of Halton, Cheshire and Pennington, Lancashire; recently of Angleston in Anglesey in Wales (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

* John Young of Guildford, Surrey; M.P. Guildford 1467-8; constable of Windsor Castle; *Wedgwood*.

NO DESIGNATION

- William Altostas senior of Atherton, Warwickshire (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
 George Baily of Selby, York (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 Jacob Balgarwey, Lancashire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 * Thomas Barowe of London, customer (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 John Bartelot (February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
 John Bergh of Netherhadden, Derbyshire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 Henry Best of Oxfordshire (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 John Bernham of Grantham, Lincolnshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Richard Blackwell of Blackwell, Derbyshire (22 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
 Robert Bool of Penford, Somerset (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 * Richard Braybroke of Norfolk, recently customer of Lynn, Norfolk (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Richard Bret of Daneham, Cheshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 John Brinckwell of Stebington, recently of Bromham, Wiltshire (seat of Sir Roger Tocotes) (16 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 William Brushwood of Parma Missenden, Buckinghamshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 Robert Catterawe, Macclesfield, Cheshire (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 John Clerk of Witham, Surrey (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 John Chapman recently of Sudbury, Devon, recently of Ballingdon, Essex, recently collector of the fifteenths and tenths in Essex for the King (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 Roger Chetwood, recently of Nantwich, Cheshire (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 William Coorte of Stoke over Hampden, Somerset (22 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
 Robert Cornwall of Church Stanton, Devon, recently of Farway, Devon, recently of Somerset (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Thomas Couton of York, alias of Westminster (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Richard Dell (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
 * Richard Dutton of Lammyng, Sussex recently escheator for Edward IV in Surrey/Sussex (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Henry Edyall of London, alias of East Dereham, Norfolk, alias of Ely in the county of Canterbury (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Richard Ferne, recently of Kettleshulme, Cheshire, recently of Hartington, Derbyshire (22 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 John Frogot of Hordelowe, Derbyshire (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 William Gibbon of Wittelsey, Canterbury (13 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Richard Gill of 'Allnethelley', Shropshire and Waver, Norfolk (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Jacob Goldwell (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
 * Thomas Grayson, recently customer in Exeter, Dartmouth, alias of Plymouth (May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 * Robert Harrington recently of Pinchbeck, Lincoln, recently escheator for King Edward in Lincoln (February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 Robert Hayton of Hayton, Yorkshire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 William Hille of Eastneth, Berkshire alias of Newton near Sudbury, Suffolk, recently of Canterbury, recently of Gaynesford, Kent (seat of rebels John and William Gaynesford) (4 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 John Holme of Chenery, Buckinghamshire and of Multon, Northamptonshire (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 Robert Holme of Great Hallingbury, Essex (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
 Robert Huchens of Marleborough (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
 John Jeffrey recently of Camworth, Staffordshire (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Alexander Lye recently of London (5 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Edmund Leversegge of Selwood, Somerset (June/July) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 * Philip Loweys bailiff of the earl of Arundel and constable of the castle of Arundel (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

Thomas Meetham of Metham, Yorkshire, recently of Polyngton (July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.

- * James Morton recently of Moreton, Staffordshire, recently of Ellenhall, Staffordshire, recently collector of the fifteenths and tenths for Edward IV in the hundred of Pinchbeck, Staffordshire (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

John Neele recently of Waltham, Hampshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

- * John Norris recently of Farley, West Shefford, Berkshire (brother of rebel Sir William Norris) (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

Robert Paston of Coventry alias of Braceborough, Lincoln (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

John Pemberton of Eltham, Kent recently of Higham Ferrers; kinsman of Robert Pemberton of the same, see above (6 June) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

William Perkyns of Dunstable, Bedfordshire, innholder (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.

John Prouse recently of Combe Martin, Devon (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

Robert Ridness of Helsham, Sussex (22 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

William Shalcock of Ledston, Yorkshire (16 June) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

John Spencer of Doddinghurst, Essex (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

William Stok of 'Pyppeweth', Northampton (March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

John Symon, recently of Stokeinteignhead, Devon, recently of Exeter (February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

John Upcote of Bridgwater, Somerset (May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

John Wadham, recently of Maryfield, Somerset, son and heir of Elizabeth Wadham, recently kinswoman and heiress of Sir John Popham (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

Stephen Wayte, recently of Goodhurst, Kent (seat of Alexander Culpepper) (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

John Woodcock of Stamford, Lincoln (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

UNIVERSITIES

Richard Mayhew of the scholar's college of Mary Magdalen, Oxford (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

John Tailour, provost of the college of scholars, Oxford (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.

MISCELLANEOUS

James 'Fryjs' of Windsor, recently doctor of medicine of King Edward IV (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

Master Guild, London (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

MERCHANTS AND ARTISANS

- * William Baker of Ipswich, Suffolk, notary, recently controller of the subsidy and ulnage in Norfolk and Essex; recently of the town of Lavenham (John Risley's seat) (June) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
- * John Barker of London, goldsmith, recently customer in the port and town of Sandwich and Dover (May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
- * William Baron, haberdasher, recently alderman of London (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

John Besthan of London, tailor (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Borough, alias Burgh, recently of Lyme, Dorset (May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.

Philip Boyle of Wyke, Dorset, recently of Langton, Dorset (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

- * Thomas Breton, merchant of the Staple of Calais (March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
- * Hugh Brice of London, goldsmith (February) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

William Brogreve of London, draper (21 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

- * Hugh Bromborough of Bristol, merchant of the Staple of Calais, recently collector of the customs and subsidies in the town of Poole.

Edward Brown of Lincoln (February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

*William Brown of London (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

William Bukkyng of Bridgwater, Somerset (18 May) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

Peter Caswell of Plymouth, Devon, recently of Modbury, Devon (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.

* William Caxton of London, recently merchant of the Staple of Calais, recently master of the mercer's guild, recently in the parts of Brabant, Holland, Flanders and Zeeland (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

William Chawny of Boston, Lincoln, baker (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Thomas Cobyte of Glaston, Somerset, fuller, tonker, and Marcia his wife (28 March) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

*Thomas Cokkes of Somerset, fisher, recently customer (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

Henry Colet (d. 1505) alderman of London, mercer and stapler (an intimate of Reginald Bray) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

Thomas Cornish of London (5 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

* Richard Croke of London, merchant of the Staple of Calais (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.

Robert Crowmer of Norfolk (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.

William Dale, recently of Binton and Brewton, Somerset (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

Richard Dokking of London, mariner (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.

Geoffrey Dorner, recently of Thame, Oxfordshire (June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

William Egles recently of Pleshy, Essex, and of Great Waltham, Essex, recently of Calais (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

Robert Elys of London (4 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

* Thomas English of Northamptonshire, merchant of the Staple of Calais and recently customer for Edward IV in the town of Calais (May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

* John Fenkyll (d. 1499) of London, draper and shipowner; M.P. London, 1483 (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

* John Ferron, Norwich, alderman of Norwich (March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

William Ford of Hadley, Suffolk (May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

* Ralph Gerald of Calais, merchant of the Staple of Calais (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

* John Gosse, of Ipswich, Suffolk, merchant of the Staple of Calais, recently of Faversham, Kent (3 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.

John Green of Lynn, Norfolk (February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

John Gybbys of London (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

Richard Harrington of Fowey, Cornwall (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

Edmund Hartok recently of Chelmsford, Essex, tailor (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.

* Robert Hill of Beccles, Suffolk, yeoman, recently constable of the town of Beccles (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

Thomas Hill of Yennett, Somerset (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Robert Horner of Spalding, Lincolnshire, fisher (March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.

* Robert Hutchins of Bridgwater, Somerset, alias customer in the port and town of Bridgwater (April) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

Richard Jobe of Bridgwater, Somerset (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

Richard Kembyll, recently of Elderfield, Worcester, tailor (February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

George Kent of Lymington, Hampshire (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Richard Kyrkeby of Atherton (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

John Laurence of Kingston upon Hull (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Richard Laurence of Devizes, Wiltshire, baker (11 July) P.R.O., C67/51/31.

John Leke of Nuneaton, Warwickshire (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

Richard Louthe, recently of Lincoln, recently of London (25 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

Thomas Lytteley of London, grocer and merchant (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

William Mann of Leavenheath, Suffolk, mariner (10 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

* Robert Marshall of Kingston upon Hull, alias of Leventhorp, controller of customs and subsidies in the port and town of Kingston (15 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

* Thomas Northland, alderman and grocer of London (29 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

* Thomas Nutson, London draper, recently customer for Edward IV in the port and town of Southampton (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

William Patonson recently of Yarmouth (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/19.

John Peers recently of Great Yarmouth, Norfolk (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

Richard Polyngton of York, recently of London (May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 Thomas Ponde recently of Yarmouth, Norfolk (3 May) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 Thomas Pontesbury, of Shropshire (5 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Bartholomew Rede, recently of London, goldsmith (February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 * Thomas Reynolds (d. 1495) of Southampton; M.P. Southampton, January 1483 (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 Richard Shyllingforde of Lyme Regis, Dorset (April) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 John Stevens of Bristol and St Ives, Cornwall (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 * John Stokker recently alderman and draper of London (May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
 William Stourton of Tynched in the parish of Edyngton, Wiltshire, tailor (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 John Sutton of Rye, Sussex (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Tanner, Norfolk (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 Richard Tomyower of St Columb Major, Cornwall (28 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 * John Walker, bailiff and escheator, Southampton (replaced Walter Williams as mayor of Southampton: *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 208) (1 June) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 William Wellisine of Kingston upon Hull (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Wendy of London (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
 Simon Wogan of London (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 * Thomas Wortes, recently undersheriff of Norwich (May) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Richard York of York (February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

YEOMEN AND HUSBANDMEN

John A Barnesey of Sudbury, Devon (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 John Affane of Tonbridge, Kent (Buckingham's seat) (20 March).
 Robert Alder of Bere, Cornwall, recently of Fulford, Devon (seat of Sir Thomas Fulford) (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 William Alleward of Teynton, Devon (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
 John Appleton of Newton Ferrers, Devon (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 John Appleton of Totnes, Devon (February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Thomas Arleoff recently of Waltham Abbey, Essex (5 June) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 Richard Attwood of Woodhouse, Warwickshire (30 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 * William Awedon of Hundrage, Buckinghamshire, recently bailiff of Chesham, Buckinghamshire (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Badeley of Halghton, Shropshire (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Hugo Bailey of Leominster, Hereford (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 John Banaster of East Eshforth, Kent (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 Banco recently of Doncaster, Yorkshire, saddler (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 Robert Banke of Honke, Yorkshire (29 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 William Bayne of Salford, Somerset (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 Robert Beel of Seggford, Norfolk (March) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Humphrey Belcher of Lamport, Northamptonshire (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Benedict, yeoman of Tavistock, Devon, and Cothele, Cornwall (Richard Nanfan's residence), and of Saint Germaine, Cornwall (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 Allan Benson, of Byrton in Holland, Lincolnshire (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 John Bere recently of Godmanton, Devon, recently of Colbroke, Devon (28 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 John Bernard recently of Reigate, Surrey (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 William Beyche of Sandhurst, Kent (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 John Blackman of Sussex, yeoman (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 William Botery recently of Warkworth, Northumberland (May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Philip Boyle of Wyke, Dorset, recently of Langton, Dorset, (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 John Brette of Writtle, Essex (Buckingham's seat) (13 March) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Brewode of Mapledurham, Oxfordshire, recently of Southwark, Surrey, recently of London, Cambridge and Derby (4 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 John Brewse of Whitley, Berkshire, husbandman (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
 John Briston of South Lynne, Norfolk recently of Canterbury (June) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Broke of Wyngton, Surrey (7 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 John Burne of Chorley, Staffordshire (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 John Byrche of Kennell, Herefordshire (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
 John Cadlott of Rolvenden, Kent (Richard Guildford's seat), tanner (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 William Capton recently of Fulford, Devon, (Sir Thomas Fulford's seat) recently of Colchester, Essex (March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 William Cheveney of Frysby, Lincolnshire (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 Thomas Clark (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Robert Clenely of Westminster, Middlesex (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 John Clerk of Cavendish, Suffolk (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 Edward Colles of Longchurch, Hereford (February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 John Colyn recently of Yelyng, Middlesex (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 John Comber of Chakeham, Sussex, recently of Pulborough (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Richard Compton of Hagborn, Berkshire (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 John Couper of Chayle, Sussex (May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 John Covet of Boston, Lincolnshire (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 John Cowel of Raveningham, Norfolk, recently of Tybenham, Norfolk (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 Robert Creplynges of Yorkshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 Richard Dagshaw of Derbyshire (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Robert Dakyn of Pychmore, Derbyshire (24 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Dancer, recently of Hasley, Worcestershire (24 April) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 John Daseley of Netherkenett, Cornwall, recently of Cothele, Cornwall (rebel Richard Nanfan's seat) (22 June) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
 David ap Grono ap Dikis ap Miler of Caernarvon (February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 John Davy of Bramport, Cornwall, recently of Cothele (rebel Richard Nanfan's seat) (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 John Davy recently of Bristol, alias of Salisbury (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 John Davy of Stodbury, Devon, recently of Hempston Cantello, Devon (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 John Davy of Wymondham, Norfolk (22 February) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 John Denver of Hastings, Sussex (19 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 Peter Denynge of Axbridge, tonker (26 March) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Dey, recently of Lostwithiel, Tolvern and Wolston, Cornwall (28 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 John Deynes of Eston Davent, Suffolk (30 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 John Dilham of Remchurch, Kent (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Hugh Domelay of Chester, yeoman (recently of London, haberdasher) (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 John Donne, recently of Morton, Dorset, (a seat of Robert and Richard Morton, listed as rebels) recently of Poltern, Wiltshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John East of Broughton, Nottinghamshire (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 William Ederiche of Blythburgh, Suffolk (May) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 William Egles of Pleshy, Essex, and of Great Waltham, recently of Calais (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 Robert Ekfeld of Wethersfield, Essex (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Thomas Emmy of Newport, Hampshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Edmund Flore of Chetwood, Buckinghamshire, and Brakley, Northamptonshire (June) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Flyntt, recently of Culneham, Oxfordshire, recently of Tetsworth, Oxfordshire, recently of Yattendon, Berkshire (Sir William Norris's seat), and of Stoke Salmage, Oxfordshire (6 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Forde junior (14 April) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
 John Forester of 'Borgehershe', Sussex (May) P.R.O., C67/51/1.

Richard Fox of Wymeswold, Leicestershire (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
 John Frankwell recently of Ashburnham, Sussex (28 April) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 John Fymarke of Chippenham, Wiltshire (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Robert Geddenay of Sedgford, Norfolk, shepherd, recently of Fryng, Hecham and
 Walsingham, Norfolk (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 William Gele of Horley, Surrey (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 John Genne of South Brenta, Devon (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 John Gille of Glastonbury, Somerset, ostler (19 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 William Gleddale recently of Heppe, Westminster (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 Martin Goodale of Necton, Norfolk (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 Robert Goolde of Colyford, Devon (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 Robert Grame, recently of Southampton and London (24 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.
 John Green of Albrington, Shropshire (23 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 William Green of Westminster, Middlesex (June) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
 Thomas Grenewoof recently of Memmyingham, Yorkshire (14 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 John Grinstead of Grinstead, Kent (6 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 John Grove of Westminster, Middlesex (March 4) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 Thomas Gryme of Norfolk (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 Thomas Gyer of London, grocer (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Galfrido Hakewyll of Great Totnes, Devon (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 Stephen Hall of Brodehall, Wiltshire (6 July) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 William Harper of Thorpland in the parish of Fakenham, Norfolk (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/32.
 Walter Hawe of Filby, Norfolk (3 July) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
 John Hawgh of Winstede, Lincoln (March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 John Henry of Eastloo (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Robert Hest, recently of Horne, Surrey (24 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.
 Richard Hickcock of Alford, Surrey, recently of Sydelyscombe, Sussex (6 May) P.R.O.,
 C67/51/21.
 William Hickcock of Alford, Surey (6 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Richard Hille of Sellyng next to Horton, Kent (28 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 Thomas Hohbone of Rype, Sussex, recently of Lewes, Sussex (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 Henry Hole, Okehampton, Devon (12 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 John Huggan of London, (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 William Hugyns of Tiverton, Hereford (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 John Jane of Trecarn, Cornwall (5 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 William Janver of Winchester (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Roger Jones of Bolinghope, Hereford, butcher, recently of Cokeham, Berkshire (rebel Sir
 William Norris's seat), recently of Dartford, Kent and of Greenwich (6 March) P.R.O.,
 C67/51/18.
 John Joy of Hadleigh, Suffolk (17 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Thomas Keyte, recently of Monxton, Hampshire (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Thomas Kyrkham of Norton, Stafford (March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 John Lamkyn of Estwykam, Lincoln (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 Roger Lander of Wokyngham, Berkshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Richard Langford of Alverstoke, Hampshire (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 John Legh of Broodwok, Essex (May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Leland of Staffordshire, yeoman (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.
 Robert Lessy of London, cooper (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Richard Lethered of Hopton, Suffolk (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 John Lethyn of Bedfont, Middlesex (15 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 John Lolle of Boughton, Northampton (February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 John Lucas of Bothyng, Essex (29 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Thomas Ludgard of Ride, Devon and Ludgard, Cornwall, alias Thomas Ludgate, recently of
 Fulford, Devon (Sir Thomas Fulford's seat) (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 Robert Lynstead of Estruston, Norfolk (9 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 Richard Lyon, recently of Trenethek, Cornwall (6 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 William Maggyo of Stanton Drew and Compton Dando, Somerset (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

Richard Manne recently of Lassyngdon and Farbuthe, Gloucestershire, recently of Culnham, Oxfordshire and of Martulston, Berkshire; recently of Bokylbury (May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Marky of Walford, Hereford (February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

Hugh Massy of Brampton in the March of Wales, recently of Stanton, Herefordshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

Thomas Mittley of Netherhaddon and Calmere, Derbyshire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

John More, York (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

Richard More of 'Thonerchysgrange', in the parish of Ecclesfield, York (22 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

John Morys of Edgeworth, Gloucestershire (28 June) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

Richard Moryng of Devon (29 February) P.R.O., C67/51/9.

Roger Mosse, Donningford, Hertfordshire (8 June) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

Thomas Mountford of Barnet, Hertfordshire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

William Nettetlyton of Thornelleys, Yorkshire (18 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Richard Neville of Lincoln (4 April) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

Edmund Newell of Halifax, York, recently of Magna Thornham, Suffolk (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

Richard Norris of Winton, Hampshire (23 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Richard Oldon of Bishops Clyst, Devon, recently of Exeter (May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Owen recently of Southampton, yeoman, alias John Roger (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

Richard Palmer of Poslyngford, Suffolk (5 March) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

William Pare of Riall (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/32.

William Parkys of Worcester (February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

Andrew Patternost, son of Richard, recently of Tollesbury, Essex, recently of Tollesbury Bourghier, Essex (May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

John Payneswyk of Chipstowe in Nethrwent, March of Wales (4 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

Richard Popilweth of Scales, Yorkshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

George Popywell of Wyke, York (1 June) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

Allan Preston of Hesseytt, Suffolk (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

John Pulham, Framlingham, Suffolk (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

Robert Raby of Middlesex (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

John Richards senior of Wellington, Somerset, recently of Powderham, Devon (seat of Sir William Courtenay) (9 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

John Richardson of Cheffield, York (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

Robert Roys of Holand, Derbyshire (16 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.

Robert Russell of Tepyngton, Norfolk (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

John Ryall of Lewes and Plumpton, Sussex (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

Robert Rydneyes of Haytesham, Sussex (22 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

William Rygeley, recently of London, recently of Southwark, Surrey, recently of Burton above Trent, Staffordshire (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

John Sawyer of Buknell, Lincolnshire (13 March) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Selby of Middlesey, Canterbury (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/19.

John Seward of Nether Haddon, Derbyshire and of Bradwell (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

John Shank, recently of London, recently of Gloucester, capper, alias of Cryklade, Wiltshire (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

William Shaste, recently of Broad Clyst, Devon, recently of Poltemore (30 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

Robert Shepard of Barton in Hennerh, Warwickshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/30.

John Shere of Badrome, Somerset, recently of Glassenbury, Somerset (May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

Peter Smalwode of Elmstede, Kent (9 June) P.R.O., C67/51/23.

William Smyth of Bristol, recently janitor of Bristol Castle (20 March) P.R.O., C67/51/32.

John Snell of Hampsted Marshall, Berkshire (10 June) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Richard Snodenham of London (May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Robert Stevens of Wonford Egle, Dorset (16 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.

William Stevenson of York, cutler (February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

Robert Steward of Stapilford Tanney, Essex (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

Edward Sutton recently of Ely in Canterbury, yeoman (March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

John Syng of Lymington, Hampshire (27 March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 Richard Taillour of Tiverton, Hereford (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Richard Tapeton of Tapton, Staffordshire, recently of Sudbury, Derbyshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
 William Theyne of Spesters, Devon, and of Adlyngton, Dorset (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
 Thomas ap David ap Jenkyn of Magna Denchurch, Hereford, recently of Kylpek (25 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.
 Thomas Thome of Monyngton in Stradell, Herefordshire (22 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Thomas Thompson of Southkyme, Lincoln (4 June) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 Thomas Thorncroft of Staynford, York (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 John Tilney of Lacely, Lincoln (March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 Walter Toroldi of Toston, Suffolk, yeoman (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 William Tredecross of Byllynghurst, Sussex (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 William Tyll of Lythe, Kent (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 John Underhill recently of Bridgnorth, Shropshire, (Stafford seat and residence of Margaret Beaufort in August 1483) carpenter, recently of Carde, Kent (February) P.R.O., C67/51/3.
 Thomas Upton of Gloucestershire, recently of Hereford, recently of Coventry (18 June) P.R.O., C67/51/25.
 John Wage of Haghle, Suffolk, recently of Henley and Wederton, Suffolk (20 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 Thomas Wager of Mortonbrite, Worcester (28 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
 William Waghare of Southwell, Nottinghamshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
 William Wakefield of Weston above Trentam, Staffordshire (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/32.
 George Walys of Warmfeld, Yorkshire (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 Richard Ware recently of Bodrugan, Cornwall, recently of Wolston, Cornwall (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Waryn, recently of Fulford, Devon, (seat of Sir Thomas Fulford) recently of Redcliffe, Devon (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Thomas Waselyn, recently of Gatefulford, York, recently of Dyngham, Nottingham (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 Peter Waterman of Rolvenden, Kent (Sir John Fogge's seat) (11 March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 William Waymer recently of Dartford, Kent (February 26) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
 Thomas Wayne of Monkeley, Devon (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
 Walter Webbe of Dymmok, Gloucestershire (10 June) P.R.O., C67/51/23.
 Ralph Whitechurch of Nottinghamshire (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Richard Whitkey of Puthale, Wiltshire, recently of Knolle, recently of Stottescombe, recently of More in the parish of Rammesbury, Wiltshire (8 July) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
 John Whyddon, recently of Chagford, Devon (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 Hugh Woderone of Grantham, Lincolnshire (5 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 Henry Wothyn of Warwick (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 Peter Wrattton (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 John Wylson of Wadhouse, Leicestershire, recently of Belper and Codnor, Derbyshire (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

ECCLESIASTICS

Abbot and prior of the church of St Peter, Westminster (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Agnes, abbess of St Mary of Winton, Hampshire (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Alionora, recently prioress of the parish church of Stodeleghe, Oxfordshire (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 Anthony, prior of the monastery of Wallingford, Berkshire, alias Anthony Zouche (29 March) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 Thomas Ashby, master of St John the Baptist, Kent; parson of the church of St Clements, Sussex (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 John Ashe, prior of Taunton, Somerset (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

Thomas Atwell, prior of the monastery of Lewes, Sussex (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Thomas Atwood prior of the monastery of Mary the Virgin, Studeley, Warwickshire (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 John Baker of Duffield, Derbyshire, chaplain (March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 William Benet of Eton in Yorkshire, parson of the church in Donnington (22 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 David Berkeley prior of the church of Peter and Paul, Plympton, Devon (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 William Berkeley, abbot of the monastery of Mary of Flaxley, Hereford (1 June) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 Henry Best of the college church of St Mary of Eton, Windsor (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Robert Booth, recently dean of the cathedral church of St Peter, York (February) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 John Bourghier recently of Oxfordshire, archdeacon of Canterbury, archdeacon of Buckingham (14 June) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 Richard Branche, master of the collegiate church of Mary of Whittingham, Suffolk (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
 Thomas Brent, dean of the parish church of South Mallyng, Sussex, recently of Charyng, Kent (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Brewys, recently dean of the cathedral church of Bangor, recently of Westbury and Rodmarton, Gloucestershire, recently of Soham Court, Norfolk, recently of Essex, Herefordshire, Middlesex (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 Alan Breytoft of Tonbridge, Kent (Buckingham's seat) vicar (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 John Breytoft clerk of Tonbridge, Kent (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Henry Bryton prior of the church of St Mary Overey in Southwark, Surrey (March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 John Bulman, master of the college of John Evangelist of Rushworth (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Bulman chaplain of the parish church of Dekilburgh, Norfolk and of the church of Wattlington, Rushworth (26 May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
 John Burton chaplain of the collegiate church of Mary of Southwell (2 March) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 John Carpenter of the parish church...Worcester (February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.
 Edmund Chaderton, master of Westminster, recently of Southwell, Nottingham (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Thomas Chandler dean of the cathedral church of Hereford (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 William Chaundese, dean of the church of St Mary of Southwark, Hampshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 William Chaundeler, chaplain of Hadley, Suffolk (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
 Richard Cheltenham, abbot of the monastery of Tewkesbury (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
 John Chestre, prior of St Peter and Paul, Taunton (4 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 Richard Chyne, abbot of the monastery of St Mary, Cirencester (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.
 Simon Chyngweth of Kynwen, Cornwall, chaplain of Trurnburgh (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 John Colyngbourne, abbot of the monastery of St Peter, Winchester (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 John Darcy abbot of St Peter and Paul, Somerset (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 David, abbot of the monastery of St Mary, Flint (February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
 Dean and canons of the cathedral church of St Mary, Lincoln (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Dean and canons of the cathedral church of Cirencester (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
 Dean and canons of the collegiate church of St Mary of Southwark, Hampshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 Roger Dempster, abbot of Dorset (March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 Henry Dene, prior of the monastery of Lanthony, Gloucestershire (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 Richard Dene prior of the church of St Mary Magdalene, Worcester (April) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
 Robert Dinham master of the Hospital of John Evangelist, Canterbury (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Robert Elchester, prior of the cathedral church of Durham (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.
 Elizabeth, abbess of the monastery of Salvatorio (6 May) P.R.O., C67/51/25.

John Galey, Chichester, Sussex, chaplain, recently vicar of Westburn, Sussex (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/28.

Elias Garnet of Tullington, Sussex, vicar of the church of Ruggeswyk (20 March) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

William Gregforth, parson of the parish church of Hurworth, Lincolnshire (23 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.

Stephen Hall of St Wenne, Cornwall, vicar (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

John Hals, bishop of the convent of Lichfield (May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

Reginald Harisbeck of Littilbury, Essex, chaplain (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.

Thomas Hayward of Stokton, Warwickshire, rector (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

John Henton, prior of the monastery of St Mary of Bristol, Somerset (February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

Thomas Heyward, dean of the cathedral church of Cedde, Lichfield (April) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

Richard Hill, vicar of Fordyngton, Dorset; implicated in 'Buckingham's rebellion' (June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.

Thomas Hinton, prior of the monastery of Whitham in Winton, Hampshire (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/16.

Walter Hodges of Winchester, Hampshire, rector of the parish church of St Stoneham, archdeacon of Wynton (15 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.

William Holland, recently of Hokklysse, Bedfordshire, chaplain (4 June) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

David Hopton, archdeacon of Exeter; (implicated in the rebellion; *B.L.H.M.*, Vol. 4, p. 102) (10 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

William Hotham abbot of the monastery of Marie of Revesby, Lincolnshire (17 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

William Huckyll, vicar of Southweld and Horchurch, Essex (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/25.

Hugo, abbot of the monastery of Peter and Paul, of Abbotsbury, Dorset (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Humphrey, abbot of the monastery of Sheen (May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.

Robert Ivy, William Morgan and George Selyngton, wardens of the brothers' guild of Mary in the church of Mary of Southwark, Surrey (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Robert Jeffrey of Hereford, chaplain, recently executor of the testament of John bishop of Hereford (March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.

John, abbot of the monastery of Egwald, Worcestershire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

John, abbot of the monastery of St Martin of Wells, Sussex (18 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

John, abbot of the monastery of St German of Selby, Yorkshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

John, abbot of the monastery of St Mary of Berleigh, Nottingham (9 April) (manor, bailiwick, castle and burgess of the same town) (10 April) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

John, prior of the church of Buckenham, Norfolk (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/23.

John, prior of the church of St Peter and Paul, Bridgwater, Somerset (May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.

John, prior of the church of Merton, Surrey (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

John, prior of the church of Twynham, Hampshire (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/32.

John, prior of St Mary of Walsingham (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

John, prior of St Paul of Newenham next to Bedford (9 June) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

John Joy, prior of Boxgreen, Sussex (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

Katrina, abbess of Godstow, Oxfordshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/17.

John Kemp vicar of Hillmorton, Warwickshire (14 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

William Kene recently parson of the parish church of Huntingdon (May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.

John Kent, recently of Bristall, York, vicar (May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

Oliver King canon of the collegiate church of St May, alias archdeacon of Berkshire, alias archdeacon of Oxfordshire; secretary of Edward IV, implicated in conspiracy in June, 1483 (8 March) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

Lambert, abbot of Croyland, Lincoln (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

Robert Lane of the collegiate church of Mary of Southwell (12 March) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

William Lane, prior of the monastery of St Augustus, Northamptonshire (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

Richard Leycestre, abbot of the monastery of Mary of Oseney, Oxfordshire (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.

Peter Lokke, master of the college of Tompston (24 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 William Markowe recently of Trurnburgh, Cornwall, chaplain (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 John Marshall bishop of Laudenon (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 John Masham, prior of the church of Andrew of Bromham, Wiltshire (seat of Sir Roger Tocotes) (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 Members of the guild of St Anne, church of St Mary, Corscombe, Somerset (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 William Middleton, vicar of the cathedral church of Cedde, Lichfield (20 April) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 Thomas Millyng bishop of Hereford (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 John Mountford cleric of Temdebury, Worcester and Doreford, Shropshire, (13 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
 Thomas Nende, abbot of the monastery of Mary of Wells, Southampton, abbot of the monastery of Mary of Beaulieu, Southampton, abbot of the monastery of Kingswood, Gloucestershire (27 March) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 John Norfolk, Thomas Hopkyn and Thomas Johnson of the chapel and chantry of Benyngton, Suffolk (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
 Thomas Norwich prior of Eye, Suffolk (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 Thomas Olweston, abbot of St Peter and Paul, Malmesbury, Herefordshire (3 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Juliana Overey, abbess of the monastery of Wherewell, Southampton (9 March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
 Thomas Pakefield, abbot, Norfolk (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 Richard Palle prior of the church of St Mary of Westage, Norfolk (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Parker, prior of St Mary of Clifford in the March of Wales (May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Thomas Percy, prior, London (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Peter, prior of Oxfordshire (5 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 Philip, prior of the church of St Mary of Southwark, Southampton (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
 John Plumstede, prior of the monastery of Mary of Castle Lacy, Norfolk (15 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.
 William Pokyn, prior of the church of St Stephens, Launceston, Cornwall (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 John Porestoke, abbot of Byndon, Dorset (23 February) P.R.O., C67/51/5.
 Robert Potte, recently of Shute, Devon, chaplain (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/32.
 John Purce chaplain of Longboniton, Dorset (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/18.
 William Ramsay abbot of the monastery of St Peter, Norfolk (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/17.
 Peter Ramsom abbot of St Mary of Shyborne, Dorset (18 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 John Rede, prior of Herste in Mendlam, Suffolk, alias prior of the monastery of the Virgin Mary, Suffolk (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.
 Richard abbot of Hawnesby, Lincolnshire (May) P.R.O., C67/51/33.
 Richard, abbot of the monastery of Mary of Tewkesbury (1 June) P.R.O., C67/51/29.
 Richard, abbot of the monastery of Walor Regis, Lincolnshire (17 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Richard, prior of the monastery of Mary Magdalene of Monks Britton, York (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/30.
 Robert abbot of Athelney, Somerset (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Robert, prior of the church of St Peter and Paul, Chacombe, Northamptonshire (26 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 Robert, prior of the monastery of St Mary, Leeds, Kent (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
 Robert of Northampton, prior (March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 Roger, prior of the cathedral church of Ely (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.
 Thomas Rope, parson of Symmysborough, Dorset (14 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.
 Thomas Rotherham, recently bishop of Lincoln, archbishop of York, recently keeper of the privy seal of Edward, recently king of England; recently chancellor of England (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.
 Henry Rudyng, master of the hospital of St John Baptist, Bedfordshire (3 June) P.R.O., C67/51/21.
 John Risley, prior of the church of Horsham, Norfolk (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/34.
 John Russell, bishop of Lincoln, chancellor of England, recently keeper of the privy seal (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

John Selwood, abbot of the monastery of St Mary, Glastonbury, Somerset (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.

Gilbert Sharp, prior of the hospital of Mary of Elsingspital, London (30 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Sharp, abbot, Essex (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

Richard Sharp, cleric (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/7.

John Shepherd, abbot of the monastery of St Mary of Pratis, Leicestershire (23 March) P.R.O., C67/51/19.

Walter Stanstede, abbot of St John Baptist, Colchester (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

Robert Stanwey abbot of the monastery of Mary...(24 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

George Sutton, alias master of Burton Lazars (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.

Thomas, abbot of Basingwerk, Flintshire (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

Thomas, abbot, Herefordshire (14 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

Thomas, abbot of St Edmund's, Suffolk (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

Thomas, abbot of the monastery of Mary of Boxley, Kent (20 June) P.R.O., C67/51/30.

Thomas, abbot of the monastery of St Mary of Tewkesbury (10 May) P.R.O., C67/51/29.

Thomas, abbot of the monastery of St Mary, Yorkshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

Thomas, abbot of the monastery of St Peter and Paul, Shropshire (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.

Thomas, prior of the cathedral church of St Mary, Flint (February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

Reginald Thomas, vicar, recently of Trurnburgh, Cornwall (1 May) P.R.O., C67/51/18.

Robert Tollerton, prior of Bath in West Smithfield, London (4 March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

George Tourton of Wakefield, York, chaplain, recently of Tonbridge, Kent (Buckingham's seat) (3 April) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

John Trynnyng, abbot of Gloucester (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

William Vysy rector of Broadoak, Cornwall (25 February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

William Wagot, archdeacon of Devon, master William Wagot of Exeter (February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

Waldro, prior of St Andrews, Tywardreath, Cornwall (7 March) P.R.O., C67/51/6.

Roger Wall, archdeacon of the cathedral church of Lichfield (February) P.R.O., C67/51/1.

Wardens and guardians of the brotherhood of the guild of Mary of Westminster (16 June) P.R.O., C67/51/33.

Robert Wetynge, prior of the monastery of the Virgin Mary, of Chetford, Norfolk (8 May) P.R.O., C67/51/16.

William, abbot of the convent of Mary Rupe, York (24 February) P.R.O., C67/51/32.

William, abbot of Ford, Devon (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

William, abbot of the monastery of Sampson of Middleton, Dorset (7 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

William, abbot of the monastery of St Mary, Kirkstead, Lincoln (12 April) P.R.O., C67/51/25.

William, abbot of the monastery of St Peter, Gloucestershire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/12.

William, bishop of Winchester, John Cheyney of Pynne, Devon, John Kendal of Bridgwater, executors of the testament of Humphrey Stafford knight, earl of Devon (1 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

William, dean of the chantry college of Leicester (24 June) P.R.O., C67/51/30.

William, prior of Bemewell in Canterbury (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

William, prior of Lincolnshire (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.

William, prior of the monastery of Oswald (February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.

William, prior of Worksop, Nottinghamshire (23 May) P.R.O., C67/51/21.

William Wallingforde, recently abbot of the monastery of St Albans in Hertfordshire (February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.

Richard Watyr prior of the church of Beauvale, Nottinghamshire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.

William Waynflote, bishop of Winchester (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.

Henry West, keeper of the hospital of Julian, Southampton (28 February) P.R.O., C67/51/8.

Thomas Wilkinson, parson of the parish church of Orpynton, Kent (February) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

John Williams prior of Bodmin, Cornwall (February) P.R.O., C67/51/2.

John Wranghill, chaplain of York (20 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.

John Wykeley, abbot of the monastery of St James, Northampton (May) P.R.O., C67/51/35.

Thomas Yaxley, abbot of the monastery in Huntingdonshire (February/March) P.R.O., C67/51/5.

WOMEN

- Joanna Baldry, executrix of ...Baldry, draper of London (21 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.
- Joanna Barre, recently of Clourewall, Gloucestershire, executrix of John Barre, knt, of Clehungre, Herefordshire and Hannam, Gloucestershire (12 May) P.R.O., C67/51/15.
- Katherine Blount, recently the wife and executrix of John Blount, recently escheator of Edward IV in Worcester, recently of Sodyngton, Worcester, recently of Bridgnorth, Shropshire (Stafford seat and Margaret Beaufort's alleged residence before the revolt) (25 May) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Elizabeth Brown recently of the parish of Dorking, Surrey, recently of West Beechworth, Surrey, recently the wife of George Brown kt, formerly the wife of Robert Poynings esquire (March) P.R.O., C67/51/11.
- Joanna Colston, recently of Biley, Essex, widow, recently the wife of Jacob Marksale (February) P.R.O., C67/51/14.
- Joanna Cotteston of Stanwey, Gloucestershire recently the wife of Walter (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- Joanna Courtnell, recently of Shire, Surrey, recently wife of John Courtnell, yeoman (March) P.R.O., C67/51/9.
- Matilda Dixon, wife of John Dixon of Tonbridge, Kent (Buckingham's seat) (March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- Elizabeth, formerly the wife of Sir Thomas Lucy, deceased, who was the daughter and heiress of Henry Percy, recently earl of Northumberland (May) P.R.O., C67/51/28.
- Elizabeth, wife of Gilbert Talbot esquire (30 May) P.R.O., C67/51/26.
- Margaret Elrington wife of John Elryngton, now deceased, recently of 'Hokstnarch', P.R.O., C67/51/19.
- Alice Fowler, recently the wife of John Hulcote of Braddon, Northampton executrix (6 March) P.R.O., C67/51/20.
- Katherine, recently the wife of William Hastings, knight, Lord Hastings, executrix, recently of Ashby de la Zouche, Leicestershire (3 March) P.R.O., C67/51/27.
- Margaret Legh recently wife of Peter Legh, knight, recently the wife of Robert Willoughby esquire of Wolleston, Nottinghamshire (27 February) P.R.O., C67/51/4.
- Alicia Sewale recently of Heydon, Norfolk (26 February) P.R.O., C67/51/10.
- Anna Wingfield of Estharling, Norfolk, recently the wife of Robert Wingfield (May) P.R.O., C67/51/13.
- Joanna Yard, widow of Middlesex (30 May) P.R.O., C67/51/24.

APPENDIX 4

PEACE COMMISSIONS PRIOR TO THE REBELLION: JUNE - SEPTEMBER 1483, INDICATING LEGAL CAREERISTS, COUNTY LAWYERS, KNIGHTS, ESQUIRES AND GENTLEMEN

(All notes refer to Edward IV, except where otherwise stated. Compiled from *C.P.R.*, *B.L.H.M.*,
Vol. 4 , *Memorials* and *Wedgwood*)

CORNWALL: 29 July, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir John Catesby (Justice of the Common Pleas)

COUNTY LAWYERS: Thomas Tresawell, (removed) Thomas Limbery (removed)

KNIGHTS: Thomas Arundel (king's servant, attainted) James Tyrell (king's servant)

ESQUIRES: Edward Courtenay (king's servant, attainted)

OTHER: John Carminew, Michael Petite, Peter Tregoos, William Carnesyewe, Thomas Kellygrew, John Penlyn, William Colowe. Quite possibly some of these men were county lawyers; some such as Carminew were solid county gentry, but with no discoverable household connections. William Colowe was introduced by Richard in a number of counties; quite likely a lawyer

REBELS : Thomas Arundel, Edward Courtenay; implicated: Tresawell and Limbery.

DEVON: 28 August, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir John Catesby, Sir William Huddesfeld, King's Attorney

COUNTY LAWYERS: John Dennis

KNIGHTS: William Courtenay, Philip Courtenay, Thomas St Leger (knight of the body), John Crocker, Robert Willoughby, Thomas Fulford

ESQUIRES: Charles Dinham, John Sapcote (esquire of the body), John Halwell (household)

OTHER: Richard Wydeslade, Thomas Hexte, William Colowe, Thomas 'Bouryng'

REBELS: Willoughby, Halwell, St Leger, Fulford (listed), Crocker (listed).

DORSET: 26 June, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir John Catesby, Thomas Hussey, Morgan Kidwelly, John Calowe

KNIGHTS: Nicholas Latimer, John Newburgh (removed)

ESQUIRES: John Cheverell (king's servant), William Twynyho (king's esquire), William Martin

OTHER: Humphrey Baskerfield

REBELS: Sir Nicholas Latimer, John Cheverell, William Twynyho; implicated: John Newburgh.

SOMERSET: 26 August, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir John Catesby, Thomas Tremayle (serjeant-at-law)

COUNTY LAWYERS: John Fitzjames, John Choke, William Hody, (removed) John Biconell, (removed), Sir William Paulet (removed), John Higgons (attainted)

KNIGHTS: Giles Daubenay (knight of the body), attainted, John Newton (removed)

OTHER: Robert Stowell, William Colowe

REBELS: John Higgons, Giles Daubenay, Hody (listed); implicated: Biconell, Paulet, Newton.

WILTSHIRE: 20 July, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir John Catesby

COUNTY LAWYERS: Henry Long, John Mompesson, Robert Baynard, John Benger, (removed) John Calowe

KNIGHTS: Roger Tocotes (king's servant, attainted), Richard Beauchamp (Lord St Amand, although never summoned as such; king's servant, attainted)

ESQUIRES: Walter Hungerford (esquire of the body), William Collingbourne (king's servant, removed), John Seymour.

REBELS: Tocotes, Beauchamp, Hungerford; implicated Benger, Collingbourne.

HAMPSHIRE: 26 June, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir John Catesby, Richard Jay, (serjeant-at-law), Thomas Danvers, John Calowe

COUNTY LAWYERS: Thomas Welle, John Rogers (removed)

KNIGHTS: William Berkeley (esquire of body, attainted)

ESQUIRES: William Uvedale (esquire of body, attainted), Edward Berkeley (brother of rebel), John Brocas (removed)

OTHER: Henry More, John Coke

REBELS: William Berkeley, Uvedale; implicated: John Rogers, John Brocas.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE: 13 September, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Humphrey Starkey (chief baron of the exchequer), Thomas Whitingdon (baron of the exchequer), Thomas Tremayle (serjeant-at-law), William Catesby (brought in by Richard)

COUNTY LAWYERS: John Twynyho (cousin of rebel, removed), John Weeks, (esquire of body to Edward, removed), Thomas Baynham (removed), Thomas Limerick

KNIGHTS: John St Lo (of the household, attainted) Richard Beauchamp (as above), Richard Ratcliffe (brought in by Richard)

ESQUIRES: John Huddlestone (brought in by Richard)

REBELS: John St Lo, Beauchamp ; implicated: John Twynyho, John Weeks, Thomas Baynham.

OXFORDSHIRE: 28 June, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Richard Danvers, William Danvers (removed), Humphrey Starkey, Thomas Tremayle

COUNTY LAWYERS: Humphrey Forster

KNIGHTS: Richard Harcourt (household), Richard Croft, (esquire of body under Edward) William Stonor (knight of the body, attainted)

ESQUIRES: John Harcourt (king's servant)

GENTLEMEN: Walter Elmes (Stonor's man of affairs, removed)

OTHER: John Langston, Richard Hall

REBELS: Stonor, John Harcourt; implicated, Walter Elmes, William Danvers.

BERKSHIRE: 26 June, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Thomas Wood (serjeant-at-law), Thomas Tremayle, Humphrey Starkey

KNIGHTS: William Norris (knight of the body, attainted), Thomas Delamare (attainted)

ESQUIRES: John Norris (esquire of the body, avoided attainer)

OTHER: William Beselles (removed), John Denton (removed), Thomas Say

REBELS: William Norris, Thomas Delamare, John Norris; implicated, William Beselles, John Denton.

KENT: 30 July, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir Thomas Bryan (chief justice), John Fineux (chief justice), John Sulyard (justice of the king's bench)

COUNTY LAWYERS: Richard Page (king's servant), Robert Rede (king's servant, brought in by Richard), Roger Brent (brother of rebel, king's servant, removed)

KNIGHTS: Ralph Ashton (added by Richard), Henry Ferrers (king's servant, removed), Thomas Bourghier (knight of the body, avoided attainder, but listed as a rebel), John Fogge (of the household, attainted), John Guildford (of the household, attainted), John Scott (of the household, listed by Stow although remained on the bench)

ESQUIRES: Reginald Sands (king's servant), John Alfegh (king's servant, removed)

GENTLEMEN: Richard Lee (yeoman of the crown, removed)

REBELS: John Fogge, John Guildford; listed as rebels: Thomas Bourghier, Robert Brent, Sir John Scott; implicated: Sir Henry Ferrers, John Alfegh, Richard Lee.

SURREY: 26 June, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir Thomas Bryan, Sir John Catesby, John Sulyard, John Holgrave

KNIGHTS: John Wood (household, d. 1484), Thomas Bourghier (as above), John Norbury (of Surrey, promoted by Richard, knighted in June/July 1483, becoming king's vice-marshal in 1484)

ESQUIRES: John Gaynesford (household, attainted), Nicholas Gaynesford (esquire of the body, attainted)

GENTLEMEN: Ralph Tykull (removed, listed as a rebel)

OTHER: Thomas Wintershill (removed)

REBELS: John and Nicholas Gaynesford; Bourghier and Tykull listed as rebels; implicated, Thomas Wintershill.

SUSSEX: 26 June, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Sir Thomas Bryan, John Sulyard

COUNTY LAWYERS: Thomas Hoo, Richard Lewkenor (removed), John Goring, Thomas Oxenbridge (removed), John Stanney (removed), John Apsley (brought in by Richard)

KNIGHTS: John Wood (the elder, household, d. 1484)

ESQUIRES: John Wood (household), John Dudley, (king's servant) Thomas Coombes (exchequer, king's servant)

REBELS: implicated: Lewkenor, Oxenbridge, Stanney.

NORFOLK: 20 July, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: Roger Townshend (serjeant-at-law), Sir Richard Neel (justice of the common pleas), William Hussey

COUNTY LAWYERS: Henry Heydon, Henry Spilman, James Hobart

KNIGHTS: William Knyvet (attainted), Sir Edmund Bedingfield (removed), Tiro Robsert, William Calthorp (brought in by Richard), William Boleyn (brought in by Richard)

ESQUIRES: Richard Southwell (marshall of the exchequer), Ralph Willoughby (esquire of body under Richard, brought in and temporarily removed), Henry Strange (brought in by Richard), John Windham (brought in by Richard)

OTHER: John Fincham, Robert Clere (introduced by Richard)

REBELS: William Knyvet; implicated, Sir Edmund Bedingfield, Ralph Willoughby.

SUFFOLK: 18 August, 1483

LEGAL CAREERISTS: John Sulyard, Edmund Jenney, Sir William Hopton, William Hussey

KNIGHTS: Gilbert Debenham (knight of the body), William Brandon (attainted), Henry Wentworth (king's servant), Sir Christopher Willoughby

ESQUIRES: John Clopton, Thomas Higham, Alexander Cressyner, Robert Clere, Thomas Appleton

REBELS: Sir William Brandon.

APPENDIX 5

ATTAINED REBELS AND THOSE LISTED IN OFFICIAL INDICTMENTS AND IN THE CHRONICLE SOURCES

Compiled from the Act of Attainder: *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. VI, pp. 245-6; *B.L.H.M.*, Vols 1 & 2; rebels indicted before Lord Scrope at Torrington: Hooker, *op.cit.*, pp. 53-4; Ms BV. 1/4 for indictment before Scrope at Bodmin; *Vergil*; Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, Vol. 3

ACT OF ATTAINDER

Brecon

Henry, duke of Buckingham, John Bishop of Ely; William Knyvet kt; John Rush, late of London, merchant; Thomas Nandik, late of Cambridge, necromancer.

Kent

George Brown kt, (executed) Thomas Lewkenor kt (pardoned May 1484), John Guildford kt, John Fogge kt (pardoned February 1485), Edward Poynings esq., Richard Haute esq., (pardoned March 1485), Richard Guildford esq., John Pympe esq., Thomas Fiennes esq., (pardoned July 1484), Nicholas Gaynesford esq., (pardoned July 1484), John Gaynesford esq., (pardoned July 1484), William Clifford esq., John Darell esq., Anthony Kene esq., Thomas Ryder esq., (pardoned July 1484), William Brandon esq., (pardoned March 1484), John Wingfield esq., (pardoned early 1484, listed in the Act of Attainder but avoided actual attainder), Alexander Culpepper gent., James Horne gent., Reginald Pympe gent., (pardoned March, 1485), Robert Brewes gent., (pardoned February, 1484), John Boutayne yeoman of the crown, Roger Long yeoman, Richard Potter yeoman of the crown, (pardoned March 1484), Richard Fisser yeoman of the crown, (pardoned March 1484), William Loveday yeoman, William Strode yeoman of the crown, John Hoo yeoman, (pardoned February 1485).

Newbury

William Norris kt, (pardoned early 1484), William Berkeley kt, (pardoned May 1484), Roger Tocotes kt, (pardoned January 1485), Richard Beauchamp, Lord St Amand, (pardoned March 1484), William Stonor kt, Thomas Delamare kt, (pardoned April 1484), Richard Woodville kt, (pardoned March 1485), John Harcourt esq., (pardoned April 1484), William Uvedale esq., (pardoned January 1485), Roger Kelsale yeoman, (pardoned April 1484), Edmund Hampton gent., Walter Williams merchant, William Overay kt, Amyas Paulet, (pardoned May 1485).

Salisbury

John Cheyney esq., John St Lo kt, (pardoned April 1484), Nicholas Latimer kt, (pardoned April 1484), Giles Daubenay kt, Thomas Melbourne esq., Walter Hungerford esq., (pardoned April 1484) John Trenchard esq., William Hall gent., Michael Skilling gent., (pardoned January 1485), Humphrey Cheyney gent., William Bampton, Robert Cheyney gent., John Bevyn gent., John Heron gent., John Champney gent., William Case gent., John Higgons gent., William Baskett gent., Thomas Lynde, James Worsley yeoman, John Fesaunt gent., William Knight yeoman of the crown, Thomas Brown gent., John Melbourne gent., John Shirwell yeoman, Robert Canon yeoman, John Forde yeoman, Walter Cole yeoman, John Avere yeoman, Robert Bowdon yeoman, John Knolles, John Watts.

Exeter

Thomas Grey kt, Marquis of Dorset, Robert Willoughby kt, Thomas St Leger kt, Thomas Arundel kt, John Wells esq., Edward Courtenay esq., Richard Nanfan esq., John Halwell esq., Walter Courtenay esq., John Treffry esq., John Trevelyan gent., (pardoned December 1484), William Bolter gent., Thomas Lovell gent., (pardoned December 1484), Richard Cruse yeoman of the crown, (pardoned February 1484), William Treffry gent., Thomas Pyne gent., John Moton gent., William Frost, yeoman.

Indictment before Lord Scrope at Torrington

(The most prominent of the rebels are listed)

Thomas Fulford kt, (pardoned March 1484), John Crocker kt, Bartholomew St Leger, (pardoned February 1484), John Norris, (pardoned February 1484), Thomas Greenfield, (pardoned January 1484), Hugh Lutterell, Robert Burnaby, William Chilson.

Indictment before Lord Scrope at Bodmin

(Only names additional to Act of Attainder)

Ralph Arundel, Geoffrey Beauchamp, Remfry Densell, John Rosogan, Thomas Borlase.

Harley Manuscript 433

Cornwall: Stephen Calmady, (pardoned June/July 1484), James Bonythen esq; Devon: Richard Edgecombe, (pardoned January 1484); Dorset: Thomas Audley esq., (pardoned 1484), John Cheverell esq., (pardoned February 1484), William Twynyho esq., (pardoned March 1484), Richard Morton gent., (pardoned 1484); Somerset: William Hody gent., Thomas Bourgchier kt, (pardoned 7 December 1483 and in early 1484); Buckinghamshire/Bedfordshire: Richard Enderby kt, John Donne kt; Norfolk/Suffolk: William Brandon kt, William Loveday; Kent: John Waller esq., Stephen Gerard, William Haute kt, (pardoned February 1484), William Cheyney, John Wingfield the younger, (pardoned February 1484), John Isley, (pardoned February 1484), Ralph Tykull, John Alsey, Anthony Brown, (pardoned March 1484), Robert Brent, (pardoned February 1484), Richard Latimer, Roger Long, John Bale.

1484: John Waller esq., William Tyler.

Polydore Vergil

John Bourgchier, Evan Morgan, Edward Poynings.

Richard Grafton

Robert Poyntz, (pardoned early 1485) (adds Humphrey Cheyney to Vergil's list of exiles in Brittany).

John Stow

Sir John Scott.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Original Sources - Manuscripts

British Museum (now British Library - reference division)

Additional Charters:

- 16559 - Receiver's accounts of John Lord Howard's de Vere estates
- 40054 - 40,066 - Documents relating to the Lords Hungerford of Heytesbury, Wiltshire:
 - Indenture of settlement by Robert, Lord Hungerford Jan 10 1452
 - Grant by Thomas Lord Hungerford, 24 June 1465
 - Appointment of a receiver by Margaret Hungerford in cos Devon and Cornwall, 1465
- 40266 - Deed of 15 Sept 1473 involving Thomas St Leger and William Uvedale, kts
- 44526-44,529 - Charters relating to the family of Danvers of Culworth, Northamptonshire,
 - 10 Henry VI - 34 Henry VIII
- 64102 - Deed relating to the will of Sir Richard Nanfan, 1507
- 64303 - Petition to parliament of Thomas Courtenay, 5th Earl of Devon, claiming precedence over William Earl of Arundel, 1446

Additional Manuscripts:

- 6113 -f.74 On the occasion of the feast of Prince Edward, 1478
- f.19 List of knights at Edward IV's coronation
- 24512 - Details of Edward IV's itinerary from July 1481 - June 1482
- 34218 - Transcript from the Parliament Rolls of the controversy between William, Earl of Arundel and Thomas, Earl of Devonshire, as to precedence in the Parliament, 1448-9
- 34766 - Lists of English knights, etc. collected from a manuscript in the office of the Ulster King of Arms, and other sources
- 36542 - Register of evidences and documents concerning the family of Stafford:- title of Humphrey , Earl (created Duke, 1441), of Buckingham; valor of Thornbury manor
- 36924-36927 - Papers of the family of Norris, of Speke, co Lancashire: - valor of lands of Sir William Norris [end of 15th c.]
- 41140 - Letter from John Courtenay, 7th Earl of Devon, from Tiverton summoning aid for Henry VI, 1471
- 48031 - Letter of Edward IV to Louis XI, regarding the French expedition of 1475

Other Charters, Rolls and Manuscripts

Cotton Charters

26598- Henry Bourgchier, Earl of Essex: lease, as feoffee of the Duke of Norfolk, 1477

Cotton Manuscripts

Julius B XII - Miscellaneous material relating to Richard of Gloucester's dealings with the Countess of Oxford concerning the marriage and issue of Sir William Brandon

Egerton Rolls

2192 - Receivers and bailiffs, etc., accounts, 1485-6

Harley Charters

44B.48 - Cerne Abbey, co Dorset, general release from Roger Bemyster, abbot of, to Robert Morton, 1475

Harley Mss

542 - List of peers at Bosworth, containing noblemen and knights who fought for Richard III

3881 - In relation to the marriage of Edward Hastings and Mary Hungerford
 Indenture between Francis, Viscount Lovell and Lady Hastings, 5 May, 2
 Richard III

Lansdowne Mss

1.47 - The last will of Richard Beauchamp, 6th Lord St Amand, d. 1508

CX1.17 - Valuation of lands in Brecknock, late the duke of Buckingham's

Royal Mss

46457 - Copy of attainder of Sir William Berkeley K.B., 1485

Stowe Charters

- 26598 - Thomas Bourghier, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury: lease, as feoffee of the Duke of Norfolk, 1477
- 233 - Lease to Sir William Brandon, in cos Suffolk and Norfolk, 1482
- 45,131 - Account of the funeral of Sir Thomas Bourghier, kt, 1478, 16th century

Stowe Mss

- 440 - Extracts Indentures of War, Edward III - Henry VII
- 5524 - Pedigree of Arundel family of Lanherne, co Cornwall

Public Record Office

C1 - Early Chancery Proceedings

- 51/121 - Disputed Carmynewe inheritance: Halneth Malyverer vs Edward Courtenay
- 53/3 - Dispute involving Tyrell, Arundel and Daubenay
- 54/183 - Dispute between William Brandon junior and John Heveningham

C53 - Charter Rolls

C67 - Pardon Rolls

C81 - Chancery Warrants Series I

C82 - Chancery Warrants.- Series II

CP25 - Court of Common Pleas - Feet of Fines

- (1)/294/77 Regarding the marriage settlement of Margaret Beaufort and Thomas Lord Stanley, 1472.

DL/29 - Duchy of Lancaster, Ministers' Accounts

E404 - Exchequer of Receipt - Warrants for Issues

E405 - Exchequer of Receipt - Tellers' Rolls

KB9 - King's Bench - Ancient Indictments

PROB 11 - Prerogative Court of Canterbury wills

SC1 - Special Collections - Ancient Correspondence

Berkshire Record Office

H/RTa - Deeds relating to the Norris family of Bray

Canterbury Cathedral Library

CC/FA5-7 - Canterbury Chamberlains' Accounts 1483-4

Cornwall Record Office

DD.BW - Arundel of Lanherne Collection
DD.CF - Borlase of Castle Horneck, Penzance
DD.ME - Edgumbe Collection: manorial accounts, court rolls, rentals and surveys
 M.E.50 - nos 1-26, private estate documents
 M.E.281/19 copy of attainder of Sir Henry Bodrugan, 1487
 M.E..821/10 Mt Edgumbe muniments (additional)
 /24 Inquisition on lands of Sir Henry Bodrugan, 1488
DD.MSR- Merchant Shipping Records
DD.TF - Treffry of Place, Fowey
DD.WH - Champernowne of Dartington Collection

Devon Record Office

Deposit 1508 - Various deeds in the Courtenay Collection, from the late 15th century
ECA Book 51 - Hooker's Commonplace Book

Dorset Record Office

Bridport Borough Archives

DC/BTB Richard III at Bridport on November 5, 1483

Pitt Rivers Collection

D/PIT Recollections of Thomas West in relation to the escape of rebel Sir Francis
 Cheyney to Brittany in 1483

Weld of Lulworth Castle

D/WLC Lady Cecily, Duchess of York - chief landowner in Gussage St Michael,
 Dorset

Royal Institution of Cornwall

BV 1 - Borlase Memoranda

Southampton Record Office

SC 5/1 Stewards' books - 1483-4: two journeys to London from Southampton to defend
 privileges granted to the town 3 December 1483; SC 5/1/19 f. 31v, ton
 of wine sent to Richard on 8 November

B. Original Sources - Printed

Abstracts of Somerset Wills, ed. F. A. Crisp, 6 vols (London, 1887).

A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds, H.M.S.O., 6 vols (London, 1890-1915).

'A Letter from John Gage, Esq. Director, to Sir Henry Ellis, Secretary, accompanying extracts
from the Household Books of Edward Stafford, Duke of Buckingham', *Archaeologia*,
Vol. XXV (1834), pp. 311-341.

An English Chronicle, ed. J. S. Davies, Camden Society, First Series, Vol. LXIV (1856).

'An Extract relating to the burial of King Edward IV', *Archaeologia*, Vol. I (1770), pp. 348-
55.

- A Relation, or Rather a True Account of the Island of England*, ed. C.A. Sneyd, Camden Society (1847).
- 'A Spanish Account of the Battle of Bosworth', ed. E. M. Nokes and G. Wheeler, *The Ricardian*, Vol.II, No. 36 (1973), pp. 1-5.
- Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript*, ed. J.W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall, 3 vols (London, 1868).
- British Library Harleian Manuscript 433*, ed. R. Horrox, P. W. Hammond, 4 vols (Gloucester, 1979, 1980 & 1983).
- Calendar of Close Rolls, 1399 -1509*, 18 vols., H.M.S.O. (London, 1927-63).
- Calendar of Entries in the Papal Register relating to Great Britain and Ireland*. ed. J. A. Twemlow, Vol. XIV, 1484-1492 (1960).
- Calendar of Fine Rolls, 1461-1509*, 3 vols., H.M.S.O. (1949-62).
- Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, Henry VII*, 3 vols., H.M.S.O.(1898-1955).
- Calendar of Lincoln Wills*, Vol. I, 1320-1600, ed. C.W. Foster, British Record Society, Vol. XXVIII (London, 1902).
- Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1399-1509*, 17 vols., H.M.S.O. (London, 1903-16).
- Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Existing in the Archives and Collections of Milan*, ed. A. B. Hinds, Vol. I, H.M.S.O. (London, 1912).
- Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice*, Vol. I, 1202-1509 (London, 1864).
- Caxton, *The Description of Britain*, ed. M. Collins (London, 1988).
- 'Chronicle of John Stone', ed. W. G. Searle, *Cambridge Antiquarian Society Publications*, Vol. XXXIV (1902).
- Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 1470*, ed. J. G. Nichols, Camden Society (1847).
- 'Chronicle of William Gregory', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London*, ed. J. Gairdner (London, 1876).
- Chronicles of London*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1905).
- Chroniques de Jean Molinet*, ed. G. D. Doutrepoint, O. Jodogne, 3 vols, Academie Royale de Belgique Classe de Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques. Collection des Anciens Auteurs Belges (Brussels, 1935-7).
- Commynes, Philippe de, *The Memoirs for the Reign of Louis XI, 1461-1483*, translated by M. Jones (Harmondsworth, 1972).
- 'Confession of Sir Robert Welles', *Excerpta Historica, or, Illustrations of English History*, ed. S. Bentley (London, 1833).
- Devonshire Wills*, ed. C. Worthy (Exeter, 1896).
- 'Dominicus Mancinus Ad Catonem De Occupatione Regni per Ricardum Tercium Libellus', translated by C.A.J. Armstrong, *The Usurpation of Richard III*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1969).
- Early Lincoln Wills*, ed. A. Gibbons (Lincoln, 1888).

- 'Early Treatises on the Practice of the Justice of the Peace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', ed. B. H. Putnam, *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*, Vol. VIII (Oxford, 1924).
- English Historical Documents 1327-1485*, ed. A.R. Myers (London, 1969).
- Epistolae Academicae Oxoniensis*, registrum F, Part 2, 1457-1509, ed. H. Anstey, Vol. XXXVI (1898).
- Extracts from the Municipal Records of the City of York during the Reigns of Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III*, ed. R. Davies (London, 1843).
- 'Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V: Longleat Miscellaneous Manuscript', ed. R. Horrox, *Camden Miscellany*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXIX (1987).
- Foedera, Conventiones, Literae...et Acta Publica*, ed. T. Rymer, 20 vols (London, 1704-35).
- Grants etc from the Crown during the Reign of Edward the Fifth*, ed. J. G. Nichols, Camden Society, Original Series, Vol. LX (1854).
- Grazebrook, G., 'An Unpublished Letter by Henry Earl of Richmond', *Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica*, Fourth Series, Vol. V (1914), pp. 30-39.
- 'Gregory's Chronicle', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London*, ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Society (1876).
- Hairsine, R.C., and P.H., 'The Chancellor's File - Part 1', *The Ricardian*, Vol V, No. 10 (1979), pp. 2-13.
- Hairsine, R.C., and P.H., 'The Chancellor's File - Part 2', *The Ricardian*, Vol. V, No. 10 (1979), pp. 74-86.
- Halle, E., *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre & York* (London, 1550), reprinted in facsimile (Menston, 1970).
- Hardyng, J., *The Chronicle of John Hardyng, with the Continuation by Richard Grafton*, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1812).
- Historie of the Arrivall of King Edward IV*, ed. J. Bruce, Camden Society, Original Series, Vol. I (1838).
- 'Historia Johannis Rossi Warwicensis de Regibus Anglie', translated from BM. MS. Cotton Vesp. A.XII, in A. Hanham, *Richard III and his Early Historians* (Oxford, 1975).
- 'Historical Notes of a London citizen, 1483-1488', ed. R. F. Green, *E. H. R.*, Vol. XCVI (1981), pp. 585-590.
- Holinshed, R., *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 6 vols (London, 1807-8).
- Household Books of John duke of Norfolk and Thomas earl of Surrey 1481-1490*, ed. J. P. Collier (London, 1844).
- Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland*, with the continuations by Peter of Blois and anonymous writers, ed. H. T. Riley (London, 1893).

- 'John Benet's Chronicle for the years 1400 to 1462', ed. G. L. Harriss and M. L. Harriss, *Camden Miscellany* XXIV, Fourth Series, Vol. IX (1972).
- Kings' Letters, from the days of Alfred to the accession of the Tudors*, ed. R. Steele, 2 vols (London, 1903).
- Leland's Itinerary in England and Wales*, ed. L. T. Smith, 5 vols (1907-10).
- Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France*, ed. J. Stevenson, *Rerum Britannicorum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, Rolls Series, 2 vols (London, 1861).
- Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Others*, ed. C. Munro, Camden Society, Old Series, Vol. LXXXVI (1863).
- Letters of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. R. C. Anderson, Southampton Record Society, Vol. XXII (1921).
- Letters of the Kings of England*, ed. J. O. Halliwell (London, 1846).
- Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, ed. T. Stapleton (London, 1846).
- Lincoln Diocese Documents 1450-1544*, ed. A. Clerk (Oxford, 1914).
- Lists and Indexes No. IX: Lists of Sheriffs for England and Wales*, Public Record Office (London, 1898).
- Macray, W. D., *Register of Magdalen College, Oxford*, New Series, Vol. I (1894).
- Materials for the History of the Reign of Henry VII*, ed. W. Campbell, Rolls Series, 2 vols (London, 1873-7).
- More, T., *The History of King Richard III*, ed. R. S. Sylvester (New Haven, 1976).
- Myers, A.R., 'The Household of Queen Margaret of Anjou, 1452-3', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. XL (1957-8), pp. 79-113, 391-431.
- Myers, A.R., 'The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, 1466-7', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. L (1967-8), pp. 207-235, 443-481.
- 'On the Inquisitions Post Mortem for Dorset, 1215-1485', ed. E.A. Fry, *Dorset Natural History and Antiquary Field Club Proceedings*, Vol. XVII (1896), pp. 1-53.
- 'On the Inquisitions Post Mortem for Somerset, 1215-1485', ed. E. A. Fry, *Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society Proceedings*, Vol. XLIV (1898), pp. 79-148.
- Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. H. Ellis, 11 vols (London, 1824-46).
- Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*, ed. N. Davis, 2 vols (Oxford, 1971-76).
- Plumpton Correspondence*, ed. T. Stapleton, Camden Society, Original Series, Vol. IV (1839).
- Proceedings Before the Justices of the Peace in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, Edward III to Richard III*, ed. B. H. Putnam (London, 1838).
- 'Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1483-1531', ed. H. E. Salter, *Oxford Historical Society*, Vol. LXXVI (1921).
- Ricart, R., *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar*, ed. L. Toulmin Smith, Camden Society, New Series, Vol. V (1872).

- Richard III: The Road to Bosworth Field*, ed. P.W. Hammond and A. F. Sutton (London, 1985).
- Rotuli Parliamentorum*, ed. J. Strachey et. al. , 6 vols (London, 1767-77).
- Select Cases before the King's Council 1243-1482*, ed. I. S. Leadam and J. F. Baldwin (Cambridge, 1918).
- Select Cases in the Council of Henry VI*, ed. C. G. Bayne, Seldon Society (1958).
- Select Cases in the Star Chamber A.D. 1477-1509*, ed. I. S. Leadam (London, 1903).
- Six Town Chronicles of England*, ed. R. Flenley (Oxford, 1911).
- 'Some Observations relating to Four Deeds from the Muniment Room at Maxstoke Castle, co. Warwick', *Archaeologia* , Vol. XXXVIII (1860), pp.272-279.
- 'Some Oxfordshire Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1393-1510', ed. J. R. H. Weaver and A. Beardwood, *Oxfordshire Record Society*, Vol. XXXIX (1958).
- Somerset Medieval Wills 1383-1500*, ed. F. W. Weaver (London, 1901).
- Stow, J., *The Annales, or General Chronicle of England* (London, 1615).
- 'Supplementary Stonor Letters and Papers 1314-1482', ed. C. L. Kingsford, *Camden Miscellany*, Vol. XIII (1923).
- 'The Account of the Great Household of Humphrey, first Duke of Buckingham, for the year 1452-3', ed. M. H. Harris, *Camden Miscellany*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXIX (1984).
- The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil*, A.D. 1485-1537, ed. D. Hay, Camden Society, Third Series, Vol. LXXIV (1950).
- The Boarstall Cartulary*, ed. H. Salter (Oxford, 1930).
- The Book of the Knight of La Tour-Landry*, ed. T. Wright, Early English Text Society, No. 33 (1906).
- The Cely Letters: 1472-1488*, ed. A. Hanham (London, 1975).
- The Chronicles of the White Rose of York*, ed. J.A. Giles (London, 1845).
- The Coronation of Richard III: the Extant Documents*, ed. A.F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond (Gloucester, 1983).
- The Coventry Leet Book*, ed. M. D. Hariss, Early English Text Society (1907-8).
- The Crowland Chronicle Continuations 1459-1486*, ed. N. Pronay and J. Cox (London, 1986).
- The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (London, 1938).
- The Harcourt Papers*, ed. E. W. Harcourt (London, 1876).
- The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London*, ed. J. G. Gairdner, Camden Society, New Series, Vol. XVII (1876).
- The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478*, ed. A.R. Myers (Manchester, 1959).
- The Itinerary of King Richard III 1483-1485*, ed. R. Edwards, Richard III Society (1983).
- The Registers of Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells 1466-1491, and Richard Fox, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1492-1494*, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte, Somerset Record Society, Vol. LII (1937).

The Stonor Letters and Papers 1290-1483, ed. C.L. Kingsford, Camden Society, Third Series, Vol. XXIX-XXX (1919).

'The Will and Inventory of Robert Morton, 1486-88', ed. E. M. Thompson, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, Vol. XXXIII (1877), pp. 308-330.

'The Will of Henry Dene, Archbishop of Canterbury', ed. J. B. Deane, *Archaeological Journal*, Vol. XVIII (1861).

The Wiston Archives: A Catalogue, ed. J. M. L. Booker (Chichester, 1975).

Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History comprising the reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III, ed. H. Ellis, Camden Society, Old Series, Vol. XXIX (1844).

Trevelyan Papers Prior to A.D. 1558, ed. J. P. Collier, Camden Society, Old Series, Vol. LXVII (1856-7).

Warkworth, J., *A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*, ed. J. O. Haliwell, Camden Society, Original Series, Vol. X (1893).

William Worcestre Itineraries, ed. J. H. Harvey (Oxford, 1969).

'York Civic Records', ed. A. Raine, *Yorkshire Archaeological Society*, Record Series, No. 98 (1939).

C. Secondary Works

A Bibliography of English History to 1485, ed. C. Gross and E. B. Graves (Oxford, 1975).

A Bibliographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500, ed. A. B. Emden, 3 vols (Oxford, 1957-59).

A Bibliographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500, ed. A. B. Emden (Cambridge, 1963).

Acheson, E., 'The Leicestershire gentry in the Fifteenth Century c. 1422-1485', unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of New England, 1989.

Alexander, J. J., 'Devon County Members of Parliament, Part 2', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art*, Vol. XLV (1913), pp. 247-69.

Alexander, J. J., 'Exeter Members of Parliament', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art*, Vol. LX (1928), pp. 183-214.

Alexander, J. J., 'Leading Civic Officials of Exeter 1330-1537', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art*, Vol. LXIX (1938), pp. 405-21.

Alexander, J. J., 'Devon Magnates in 1434', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art*, Vol. LXXII (1940), pp. 283-303.

- Anderson, A. H., 'Henry Lord Stafford (1501-63) in Local and Central Government', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXVIII (1963), pp. 225-42.
- Anderson, R. C., *Letters of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, Southampton Record Society, Vol. XXII (1921).
- Armstrong, C. A. J., 'The Inauguration Ceremonies of the Yorkist Kings and their Title to the Throne', *T.R.H.S.*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXX (1948), pp. 51-73.
- Armstrong, C. J., 'Politics and the Battle of St Albans, 1455', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIII (1960), pp. 1-72.
- Arnold, C., 'The Commission of the Peace for the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1437-1509', *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, ed. A.J. Pollard (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 116-138.
- Arthurson, I., 'The Rising of 1497: A Revolt of the Peasantry?', *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. J. Rosenthal and C. Richmond (Gloucester, 1987), pp. 1-18.
- Arthurson, I., and Kingwell, N., 'The Proclamation of Henry Tudor as King of England, 3 November 1483', *Historical Research*, Vol. LXIII, No. 150 (February, 1990), pp. 100-6.
- Asthill, G. G., 'The Medieval Gentry: A Study in Leicestershire Society, 1350-1399', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Birmingham, 1977.
- Aston, M., *The Fifteenth Century: The Prospect of Europe* (London, 1968).
- Attreed, L. C., 'An Indenture between Richard duke of Gloucester and the Scrope family of Masham and Upsall', *Speculum*, Vol. 58 (1983), pp. 1018-25.
- Attreed, L. C., 'A New Source for Perkin Warbeck's Invasion of 1497', *Mediaeval Studies*, Vol. XLVIII(1986), pp. 514-21.
- Avery, M. E., 'An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Court of Chancery Under the Lancastrian Kings', *The Law Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXXXVI (1970), pp. 84-97.
- Avery, M. E., 'The History of the Equitable Jurisdiction of Chancery before 1460', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XLII, No. 106 (1969), pp. 129-44.
- Bacon, F., *The History of the Reign of King Henry the Seventh*, ed. R. Lockyer (London, 1971).
- Baker, A. R. H., 'Changes in the Later Middle Ages', *A New Historical Geography of England*, ed. H. C. Darby (Cambridge, 1973).
- Ball, W. E., 'The Stained Glass Windows of Nettlestead Church', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, Vol. XXVIII (1909), pp. 157-247.
- Barron, C. M., 'The Tyranny of Richard II', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XLI (1968), pp. 1-18.
- Barton, J. L., 'The Medieval Use', *The Law Quarterly Review*, Vol. 81 (1965), pp. 562-577.
- Basin, T., *Histoire de Louis XI*, ed. C. Samaran, 3 vols (Paris, 1963-72).
- Bean, J. M. W., *The Decline of English Feudalism, 1215-1540* (Manchester, 1968).
- Bean, J. M. W., 'Batchelor' and Retainer', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, New Series, Vol. III (1971), pp. 117-131.

- Beard, C. A., *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England*, Burt Franklin Research and Source Works Series (New York, 1904).
- Bellamy, J. G., 'Justice under the Yorkist Kings', *American Journal of Legal History*, Vol. 9 (1965), pp. 135-55.
- Bellamy, J. G., *The Law of Treason in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1970).
- Bellamy, J. G., *Crime and Public Order in England in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1973).
- Bennett, H. S., *The Pastons and their England. Studies in an Age of Transition* (London, 1968).
- Bennett, M. J., 'A County Community: Social Cohesion Amongst the Cheshire Gentry, 1400-1425', *Northern History*, Vol. VIII (1973), pp. 24-44.
- Bennett, M. J., "'Good Lords" and "King Makers": The Stanleys of Lathom in English Politics, 1385-1485', *History Today*, Vol. 31, No. 7 (1981), pp. 12-17.
- Bennett, M. J., *Community, Class and Careerism: Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Bennett, M. J., *The Battle of Bosworth* (Gloucester, 1985).
- Bennett, M. J., *Lambert Simnel and the Battle of Stoke* (Gloucester, 1987).
- Bennett, M. J., 'Memoir of a Yeoman in the Service of the House of York, 1452-1461', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 106 (1989), pp. 259-264.
- Bennett, M. J., 'Henry VII and the Northern Rising of 1489', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CV (1990), pp. 34-59.
- Bernard, G. W., 'The Fortunes of the Greys, Earls of Kent, in the Early Sixteenth Century', *Historical Journal*, Vol. XXV, No. 3 (1982), pp. 671-85.
- Bernard, G. W., *The Power of the Early Tudor Nobility: A Study of the Fourth and Fifth Earls of Shrewsbury* (Totowa, 1985).
- Blair, C. H. Hunter, 'Two Letters Patent from Hutton John near Penrith, Cumberland', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, Fourth Series, No. 39 (1961), pp. 367-70.
- Blatcher, M., *The Court of King's Bench 1450-1550* (London, 1978).
- Blomefield, F., *An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*, continued by C. Parkin, 5 vols (London, 1739-75).
- Bolton, S., 'Sir John Fogge of Ashford', *The Ricardian*, Vol. IV, No. 69 (1980), pp. 202-9.
- Borlase, W. C., *The Descent, Name and Arms of Borlase of Borlase in the County of Cornwall* (London, 1888).
- Botolph, C., and Stourton, J., *The History of the Noble House of Stourton*, 2 vols (London, 1899).
- Brenan, G., *A History of the House of Percy* (London, 1902).
- Brenan, G., and Stratham, E. P., *The House of Howard* (New York, 1908).
- Bridbury, A. R., 'Domesday Book: a re-interpretation', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CV (1990), pp. 284-309.
- Brown, A.L., 'The Authorization of Letters under the Great Seal', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXVII (1964), pp. 125-55.

- Brown, A. L., Webster, B., 'The Movements of the Earl of Warwick in the Summer of 1464 - a Correction', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXI (1966), pp. 80-82.
- Brown, A. L., 'The King's Councillors in Fifteenth Century England', *T.R.H.S.*, Fifth Series, Vol. XIX (1969), pp. 95-118.
- Browne, A., 'The Bray Family in Gloucestershire', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, Vol. LV (1933), pp. 293-315.
- Buck, G., *The History of King Richard III*, ed. A.N., Kincaid (Gloucester, 1982).
- Budden, J., 'A Biographical Sketch of Cardinal Morton: From a Manuscript (c. 1610) in the Possession of the President', *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Field Club*, Vol. III (1879), pp. 49-73.
- Calmette, J., and Perinelle, G., *Louis XI et L'Angleterre: 1461-1483* (1930).
- Cam, H. M., *Liberties and Communities in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1944).
- Cam, H. M., 'The Legislators of Medieval England', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. XXXI (1945), pp. 127-150.
- Cam, H. M., 'Shire Officials: Coroners, Constables and Bailiffs', *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, ed. J. F. Willard et.al. The Medieval Academy of America, Vol. III (1950), pp. 143-183.
- Cameron, A., 'The Giving of Livery and Retaining in Henry VII's Reign', *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, Vol. XVIII (1974), pp. 17-35.
- Campling, A., 'Browne of Elsing, Co. Norfolk', *Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica*, Fifth Series., Vol. IX (1935-7), pp. 317-21.
- Carew, R. *The Survey of Cornwall, 1602*, ed. F. E. Halliday (London, 1953).
- Carpenter, C., 'Sir Thomas Malory and Fifteenth-Century Local Politics', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LIII (1980), pp. 31-43.
- Carpenter, D. A., 'Was there a crisis of the knightly class in the thirteenth century? The Oxfordshire evidence', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XCIV (1980), pp. 721-752.
- Carpenter, M. C., 'Political Society in Warwickshire, c. 1401-72', Ph. D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1976.
- Carpenter, M. C., 'The Beauchamp affinity: a study of bastard feudalism at work', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XCV (1980), pp. 514-532.
- Carpenter, M. C., 'The duke of Clarence and the midlands: a study in the interplay of local and national politics', *Midland History*, Vol. XI (1986), pp. 23-48.
- Carpenter, M. C., *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401-1499* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Carter, W. F., *The Quatremains of Oxfordshire* (Oxford, 1936).
- Castlehow, J. A. S., 'The Duchy of Lancaster in the County of Devon', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art*, Vol. LXXX (1948), pp 193-209.

- Chandler, R., *Life of Waynflete* (Oxford, 1811).
- Cherry, M., 'The Courtenay Earls of Devon: The Formation and Disintegration of a Late Medieval Aristocratic Affinity', *Southern History*, Vol. I (1979), pp. 71-97.
- Cherry, M., 'The Crown and the Political Community in Devonshire', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wales (1981).
- Cherry, M., 'The Struggle for Power in Mid-Fifteenth-Century Devonshire', *Patronage the Crown and the Provinces*, ed. R. A. Griffiths (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 123-44.
- Chippindall, W. H., 'Tunstall of Thurland Castle', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, New Series, No. 28 (1928), pp. 292-313.
- Chope, R. P., 'The Lord Dinham's Lands', *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, Vol. XLII (1911), pp. 269-92.
- Chope, R. P., 'The Last of the Dynhams', *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, Vol. L (1918), pp. 431-92.
- Chrimes, S. B., *English Constitutional Ideas in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1936).
- Chrimes, S. B., *Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII* (London, 1964).
- Chrimes, S. B., 'The Landing Place of Henry of Richmond, 1485', *Welsh History Review*, Vol. II (1964-5), pp. 173-80.
- Chrimes, S. B., *Henry VII* (London, 1968).
- Chrimes, S. B., 'The Reign of Henry VII', *Fifteenth Century England*, ed. S.B. Chrimes, C. D. Ross and R.A. Griffiths (Manchester, 1972), pp. 1-28.
- Clark, L., 'The Benefits and Burdens of Office: Henry Bourghier (1408-83), Viscount Bourghier and Earl of Essex, and the Treasurership of the Exchequer', *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England*, ed. M. Hicks (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 119-136.
- Clarke, R. R., *East Anglia* (London, 1960).
- Clough, C. H., 'Federigo Veterani, Polydore Vergil's 'Anglica Historia' and Baldassare Castiglione's "Epistola...ad Henricum Angliae regem"', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXII (1967), pp. 772-9.
- Clough, C. H., 'The Coronation of Richard III: The Extant Documents', a review article, *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 85 (June, 1984), pp. 346-352.
- Coleman, C. H. D., 'The Execution of Hastings: A Neglected Source', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LIII, No. 53 (1980), pp. 244-47.
- Collinson, J., *The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset* (London, 1892).
- Colvin, H. M., 'Castles and Government in Early Tudor Government', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXIII (1968), pp. 225-34.
- Complaint and Reform in England 1436-1714*, ed. W. H. Dunham Jnr. and S. Pargellis (New York, 1938).

- Condon, M., 'Kaleidoscope of Treason: Fragments from the Bosworth Story', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VII, No. 92 (1986), pp. 208-211.
- Condon, M., 'From Caitiff and Villain to Pater Patriae: Reynold Bray and the Profits of Office', *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England*, ed. M. Hicks (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 137-168.
- Conway, A. E., 'The Maidstone Sector of Buckingham's Rebellion October 18, 1483', *Archaeologia Cantiana, being Transactions of the Kent Archaeological Society*, Vol. XXXVII (1925), pp. 97-119.
- Cooper, C. H., *Memoir of Margaret Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge, 1874).
- Cooper, W. D., 'Pedigree of the Lewkenor Family', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, No. 3 (1850), pp. 89-102.
- Coward, B., *The Stanleys, Lords Stanley and Earls of Derby, 1385-1672*, Chetham Society, Third Series (1983).
- Crawford, A., 'The King's Burden?: the Consequences of a Royal Marriage in Fifteenth-Century England', *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England*, ed. R. A. Griffiths (Gloucester, 1981).
- Crawford, A., 'The Mowbray Inheritance', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 79-85.
- Crawford, A., 'The Private Life of John Howard: A Study of a Yorkist Lord, his Family and Household', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P.W. Hammond (London, 1986), pp. 6-24.
- Croft, O. G. S., *The House of Croft of Croft Castle* (Hereford, 1949).
- Darby, H. C., *The Domesday Geography of Eastern England* (Cambridge, 1971).
- Darby, H. C., *Domesday England* (Cambridge, 1977).
- Davies, C. S. L., 'Bishop John Morton, the Holy See and the Accession of Henry VII', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CII (1987) pp. 2-30.
- Davies, C. S. L., 'A Requiem for King Edward', *The Ricardian*, Vol. IX, No. 114 (1991), pp. 102-5.
- Defoe, D., *A Tour through the whole Island of Great Britain*, ed. P. Rogers (Harmondsworth, 1971).
- de Fonblanque, E. B., *Annals of the House of Percy from the Conquest to the Opening of the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols(London, 1887).
- Denholm-Young, N., *The Country Gentry in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1969).
- Dockray, K., 'The Yorkshire Rebellions of 1469', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI , No. 83 (1983), pp. 246-56.
- Dockray, K., 'Sir Marmaduke Constable of Flamborough', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 218-223.

- Dockray, K., 'The Political Legacy of Richard III in Northern England', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. A. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 205-227.
- Dockray, K., 'Richard III and the Yorkshire Gentry', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (London, 1986), pp. 38-57.
- Dockray, K., *Richard III: A Reader in History* (Gloucester, 1988).
- Documents illustrating the History of Civilization in Medieval England: 1066 - 1500*, ed. R. Trevor Davies (London, 1926).
- Drewett, R., and Redhead, M., *The Trial of Richard III* (Gloucester, 1984).
- du Boulay, F. R. H., *An Age of Ambition. English Society in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 1970).
- Dunham, W. H., 'Lord Hastings' Indentured Retainers 1461-1483: The lawfulness of Livery and Retaining under the Yorkists and Tudors', *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. XXXIX (September, 1955).
- Dunham, W. H., and Wood, C. T., 'The Right to Rule in England: Depositions and the Kingdom's Authority, 1327-1485', *American Historical Review*, Vol. LXXXI (1976), pp. 738-61.
- Dunlop, J. R., 'Pedigree of the family of Crioll, or Kyriell, of co. Kent', *Miscellanea Genealogia et Heraldica*, Fifth Series, No. 6 (1927), pp. 254-61.
- Edward IV's French Expedition of 1475: the Leaders and their Badges*, ed. F. P. Barnard (Oxford, 1925).
- Edwards, J. G., 'The "Second" Continuation of the Crowland Chronicle: Was it Written in Ten Days?', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 100 (1966), pp. 117-129.
- Elliot, H. L., 'Fitz Lewes, of West Horndon, and the Brasses at Ingrave', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, New Series, Vol. VI (1898), pp. 28-59.
- Elton, G. R., *The Sources of History: England 1200-1640* (London, 1969).
- Elton, G. R., *England under the Tudors* (London, 1974).
- Elton, G. R., 'The Rolls of Parliament, 1449-1547', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (1979), pp. 1-29.
- Emery, F., *The Oxfordshire Landscape* (London, 1974).
- Emery, F. V., 'England circa 1600', *A New Historical Geography of England*, ed. H. C. Darby (Cambridge, 1973).
- Erlanger, P., *Margaret of Anjou Queen of England* (London, 1970).
- Evans, H. T., *Wales in the Wars of the Roses* (Cambridge, 1915).
- Everitt, A., *Suffolk and the Great Rebellion 1640-1660*, Suffolk Record Society, Vol. III (1961).
- Everitt, A., *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-60* (Leicester, 1966).

- Farrar, C. P., and Evans, A. P., *English Translations from Medieval Sources* (New York, 1946).
- Farrer, P. B., and Sutton, A. F., 'The Duke of Buckingham's sons, October 1483 - August 1485', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 78 (September, 1982), pp. 87-92.
- Finberg, H. P. R., *Tavistock Abbey* (New York, 1969).
- Fleming, P. W., 'Charity, Faith, and the Gentry of Kent 1422-1529', *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, ed. A. J. Pollard (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 36-58.
- Fleming, P. W., 'The Hautes and their 'Circle': Culture and the English Gentry', *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. P. Williams (Suffolk, 1987), pp. 85-102.
- Fletcher, A., *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (London, 1975).
- Foss, E., *The Judges of England*, Vol. IV (London, 1851).
- Fox, A., 'Archetype and Antitype: The History of King Richard III, The Four Last Things', *Thomas More: History and Providence*, ed. B. Blackwell (Oxford, 1982).
- Fuller, A. E., 'Cirencester Documents', *Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society Transactions*, Vol. XX (1895-6), pp. 114-126.
- Fuller, T., *The History of the Worthies of England* (London, 1662).
- Gairdner, J., *History of the Life and Reign of Richard the Third* (Cambridge, 1898).
- Gilbert, C. S., *An Historical Survey of the County of Cornwall*, 2 vols (London, 1817).
- Gillingham, J., *The Wars of the Roses: Peace and Conflict in Fifteenth-Century England* (London, 1981).
- Gilson, J. P., 'A Defence of the Proscription of the Yorkists in 1459', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XXVI (1911), pp. 512-25.
- Given-Wilson, C., *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages*, (London, 1987).
- Given-Wilson, C., 'Wealth and Credit, Public and Private: The Earls of Arundel, 1306-1397', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CVI (1991), pp. 1-26.
- Glynne, S., 'Notes on Some Dorset Churches', *Dorset Proceedings*, Vol. XLV (1924), pp. 22-4.
- Goodman, A., *A History of England From Edward II To James I* (London, 1977).
- Goodman, A., *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1981).
- Goodman, A., and Mackay, A., 'Notes and Documents: A Castilian report on English Affairs, 1486', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXIII (1973), pp. 92-99.
- Goodman, A., and Morgan, D., 'The Yorkist Claim to the Throne of Castile', *Journal of Medieval History*, Vol. XI (1985), pp. 61-71.
- Gransden, A., *Historical Writing in England c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London, 1982).
- Green, V. H. H., *The Later Plantagenets* (London, 1955).

- Greenfield, B. W., 'The descent of the manor and advowson of Hampton Poyle', *The Herald and Genealogist*, Vol. I (1863), pp. 209-24.
- Griffiths, R. A., 'Local Rivalries and National Politics - the Percies, the Nevilles and the Duke of Exeter', *Speculum*, Vol. XLIII, No.4 (1968), pp. 589-639.
- Griffiths, R. A. 'Wales and the Marches', *Fifteenth Century England*, ed. S.B. Chrimes, C. D. Ross and R. A. Griffiths (Manchester, 1972), pp. 145-172.
- Griffiths, R. A., 'Duke of York's Intentions and the Origins of the Wars of the Roses', *Journal of Medieval History*, Vol. I (1975), pp. 187-209.
- Griffiths, R. A., 'Richard, duke of York and the Royal Household in Wales 1449-1450', *Welsh Historical Review*, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (1976), pp. 14-25.
- Griffiths, R. A., 'The Sense of Dynasty in the Reign of Henry VI', *Patronage, Pedigree, and Power in Later Medieval England*, ed. C. D. Ross, (Gloucester, 1979).
- Griffiths, R. A., 'Public and Private Bureaucracies in the Fifteenth Century', *T.R.H.S.*, Fifth Series, Vol. XXX (1980), pp. 109-30.
- Griffiths, R. A., *The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority 1422-1461* (London, 1981).
- Griffiths, R. A., 'Richard III' by Charles Ross, a Review Article, *E.H.R.*, Vol. XCVIII (1983), pp. 362-366.
- Griffiths, R. A., 'The King's Council and the First Protectorate of the Duke of York, 1453-54', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XCIX (1984), pp. 67-82.
- Griffiths, R. A., Thomas, R. S., *The Making of the Tudor Dynasty* (Gloucester, 1985).
- Griffiths, R. A., 'The Crown and the Royal Family in Later Medieval England', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. A. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 15-26.
- Grosjean, P., *Henrici VI Angliae Regis Miracula Postuma*, Societe des Bollandistes (Bruxelles, 1935).
- Gunn, S. J., 'The King and his Favourite Courtier: the Rise of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk 1514-1526', *Rivals in Power: Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties*, ed. D. Starkey (London, 1990), pp. 50-65.
- Gunn, S. J., 'Early Tudor Dates for the Death of Edward V', *Northern History*, Vol. XXVIII (1992), pp. 213-216.
- Guth, D. J., *Late-medieval England 1377-1485, Conference on British Studies Bibliographical Handbooks*, ed. J. J. Hecht (Cambridge, 1976).
- Guth, D. J., 'Richard III, Henry VII and the City: London Politics and the "Dun Cowe"', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 185-204.
- Hairsine, P. C., 'Dorset in the Life and Times of Richard III', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 333-338.

- Hairsine, R. C., 'Oxford University and the Life and Legend of Richard III', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 307-332.
- Halliday, F. E., *A History of Cornwall* (London, 1959).
- Halsted, C. A., *Richard III as Duke of Gloucester and King of England*, 2 vols (London, 1844).
- Hammond, P. W., 'An Early Account of the Reign of Richard III', *The Ricardian*, Vol. III, No. 44 (1974), pp. 16-18.
- Hammond, P. W., 'Opposition to Henry Tudor after Bosworth', *The Ricardian*, Vol. IV, No. 55 (1976), pp. 27-8.
- Hammond, P. W., 'Henry Tudor's Landing', *The Ricardian*, Vol. IV, No. 57 (1977), pp. 22-3.
- Hammond, P. W., and White, W. J., 'The Sons of Edward IV: A Re-examination of the Evidence on their Deaths and on the Bones in Westminster Abbey', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 104-147.
- Hammond, P. W., *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury* (Gloucester, 1990).
- Hampton, W. E., *Memorials of the Wars of the Roses*, The Richard III Society (1979).
- Hampton, W. E., 'Bishop Stillington's Chapel at Wells and his Family in Somerset', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 166-172.
- Hampton, W. E., 'Opposition to Henry VII after Bosworth', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 173-175.
- Hampton, W. E., 'John Nesfield', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 176-183.
- Hampton, W. E., 'Sir Robert Percy and Joyce his Wife', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 184-194.
- Hampton, W. E., 'Sir James Tyrell: With Some Notes on the Austin Friars London and Those Buried There', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 203-217.
- Hampton, W. E., 'John Hoton of Hunwick and Tudhoe', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VII, No. 88 (1985), pp. 2-17.
- Hanbury, H. G., 'The Legislation of Richard III', *American Journal of Legal History*, Vol. VI (1962), pp. 95-113.
- Hanham, A., 'Richard III, Lord Hastings and the Historians', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXVII (1972), pp. 233-248.
- Hanham, A., 'Hastings Redivivus', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XC (1975), pp. 821-27.
- Hanham, A., *Richard III and his Early Historians, 1483-1535* (Oxford, 1975).
- Harding, A., 'The Origins and Early History of the Keeper of the Peace', *T.R.H.S.*, Fifth Series, Vol. X (1960), pp. 85-109.
- Harding, A., *The Law Courts of Medieval England* (London, 1973).
- Hare, J. N., 'The Wiltshire Risings of 1450: Political and Economic Discontent in Mid-Fifteenth Century England', *Southern History*, Vol. IV (1982), pp. 13-31.

- Harper-Bill, C., 'The Familia, Administrators and Patronage of Archbishop John Morton', *Journal of Religious History*, Vol. X, No. 4 (1979), pp. 236-252.
- Harris, B. J., 'Landlords and Tenants in England in the Later Middle Ages: the Buckingham Estates', *Past and Present*, Vol. 43 (1969). Also reprinted in *Peasants Knights and Heretics: Studies in Medieval English*, ed. R. H. Hilton (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 216-21.
- Harris, B. J., *Edward Stafford, Third Duke of Buckingham, 1478-1521* (Stanford, 1986).
- Harris, O. D., 'The Transmission of the News of the Tudor Landing', *The Ricardian*, Vol. IV, No. 55 (1976), pp. 5-12.
- Harris, O. D., 'Tudor Heraldry at Bosworth', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 271-280.
- Harris, O. D., 'Harcourt and the Bosworth Standard', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 281-2.
- Harriss, G. L., *Cardinal Beaufort* (Oxford, 1988).
- Harrison, G. L., 'Notes on the Lovells of East Harling', *Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society*, No. 18 (1914), pp. 46-72.
- Hastings, M., *The Court of Common Pleas in Fifteenth-Century England* (New York, 1947).
- Hatcher, J., *Rural Economy and Society in the Duchy of Cornwall, 1300-1500* (Cambridge, 1970).
- Hay, D., 'The Manuscript of Polydore Vergil's "Anglia Historia"', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LIV (1939), pp. 240-51.
- Hay, D., *Polydore Vergil: Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters* (Oxford, 1952).
- Hay, D., *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1977).
- Helmholz, R. H., 'The Sons of Edward IV: A Canonical Assessment of the Claim that they were Illegitimate', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 91-103.
- Hexter, J. H., 'Storm over the Gentry', *Encounter*, Vol. XV (1958), pp. 22-34.
- Hicks, M. A., 'Dynastic Change and Northern Society: the Career of the Fourth Earl of Northumberland, 1470-89', *Northern History*, Vol. XIV (1978), pp. 78-107.
- Hicks, M. A., 'The Changing role of the Wydevilles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, ed. C. Ross (Gloucester, 1979), pp. 60-86.
- Hicks, M. A., 'Descent, Partition and Extinction: the "Warwick Inheritance"', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LII (1979), pp. 116-28.
- Hicks, M. A., *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence* (Gloucester, 1980).
- Hicks, M. A., 'Attainder, Resumption and Coercion 1461-1529', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. III (1984), pp. 15-31.

- Hicks, M. A., 'Piety and Lineage in the Wars of the Roses: the Hungerford Experience', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 90-108.
- Hicks, M. A., 'The Yorkshire Rebellion of 1489 Reconsidered', *Northern History*, Vol. XXII (1986), pp. 39-62.
- Hicks, M. A., 'Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the North', *Richard III and the North*, ed. R. Horrox, Studies in Regional and Local History, No. 6, University of Hull (1986), pp. 11-26.
- Hicks, M. A., 'The Last Days of Elizabeth Countess of Oxford', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CIII (1988), pp. 76-95.
- Hicks, M. A., 'Did Edward Outlive His Reign or Did He Outreign His Life?' *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 108 (1990), pp. 342-345.
- Hicks, M. A., 'The Statute of Livery', *Historical Research*, Vol. LXIV, No. 153 (1991), pp. 15-28.
- Hicks, M. A., 'Unweaving the Web: The Plot of July 1483 against Richard III and its Wider Significance', *The Ricardian*, Vol. IX, No. 114 (1991), pp. 106-109.
- Hillier, K., 'The Rebellion of 1483: A Study of Sources and Opinions', part 1, *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 70 (1982), pp. 81-92.
- Hillier, K., 'The Rebellion of 1483: A Study of Sources and Opinions', part 2, *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 80 (1983), pp. 146-158.
- Hillier, K., 'William Colyngbourne', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 101-106.
- Hillier, K., Normark, P., and Hammond, P. W., 'Colyngbourne's Rhyme', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 107-108.
- Hillier, K., 'Walter Hungerford', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 109-115.
- Hillier, K., 'Sir Roger Tocotes', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 116-121.
- Hillier, K., 'John Harcourt', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 122-127.
- Hillier, K., 'William Norris', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 128-133.
- Hillier, K., 'Four Southampton Rebels of 1483', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 134-139.
- Hillier, K., 'A Rebel of 1483: Sir Thomas de la Mare', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 140-145.
- Hilton, R. H., *A Medieval Society, The West Midlands at the End of the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1967).

- Hilton, R.H., *The English Peasantry in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1975).
- Horrox, R., 'The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III', Ph. D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1977.
- Horrox, R., 'British Library Harleian Manuscript 433', *The Ricardian*, Vol. V, No. 10 (1979), pp. 87-91.
- Horrox, R., 'Henry Tudor's Letters to England during Richard III's reign', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 80 (1983), pp. 155-158.
- Horrox, R., 'Richard III and London', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 85 (1984), pp. 322-329.
- Horrox, R., 'Richard III and the East Riding', *Richard III and the North*, ed. R. Horrox, Studies in Regional and Local History, No. 6, University of Hull (1986), pp. 82-107.
- Horrox, R., 'Recent Work on Richard III - A Survey', review article, *The Ricardian*, Vol. VII, No. 95 (1987), pp. 279-283.
- Horrox, R., *Richard III: A Study of Service* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Horrox, R., and Sutton, A. F., 'Some Expenses of Richard Duke of Gloucester, 1475-7', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 83 (Dec. 1983), pp. 266-269.
- Houghton, K., 'Theory and Practice in Borough Elections to Parliament during the Later Fifteenth Century', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIX (1966), pp. 130-140.
- Humphreys, A.L., *Somersetshire Parishes, A Handbook of Historical Reference*, 2 vols (London, 1905).
- Hutchins, J., *The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset*, Vol. III (London, 1868).
- Hutton, W., *The Battle of Bosworth Field* (Birmingham, 1788), 2nd ed. J. Nichols (London, 1813).
- Ives, E. W., 'The Reputation of the Common Lawyers in English Society, 1450-1550', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, Vol. VII (1959-60), pp. 130-61.
- Ives, E. W., 'Andrew Dymmock and the Papers of Anthony, Earl Rivers, 1482-3', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XLI (1968), pp. 216-229.
- Ives, E. W., 'The Common Lawyers in Pre-Reformation England', *T.R.H.S.*, Fifth Series, No. 18 (1968), pp. 145-173.
- Ives, E. W., *Faction in Tudor England* (London, 1979).
- Ives, E. W., *The Common Lawyers of Pre-Reformation England: Thomas Kebell, A Case Study* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Jack, R. I., 'Entail and Descent: The Hastings Inheritance', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXVIII (1965), pp. 1-19.
- Jalland, P., 'The Influence of the Aristocracy on Shire Elections in the North of England, 1450-1470', *Speculum*, Vol. XLVII (1972), pp. 483-507.
- Jefferies, P., 'The Medieval Use as Family Law and Custom: the Berkshire Gentry in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', *Southern History* (1979), pp. 45-69.
- Jefferies, R., 'The Poynings-Percy Dispute', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIV (1961), pp. 148-64.

- Jessup, F. W., *A History of Kent* (London, 1958).
- Jewell, H. M., *English Local Administration in the Middle Ages* (Newton Abbot, 1972).
- Johnson, P. A., *Duke Richard of York 1411-1460* (Oxford, 1988).
- Jones, A., *Tewkesbury* (Surrey, 1987).
- Jones, M. K., 'Richard III and the Stanleys', *Richard III and the North*, ed. R. Horrox, Studies in Regional and Local History, No. 6, University of Hull (1986), pp. 27-50.
- Jones, M. K., 'Henry VII, Lady Margaret Beaufort and the Orleans Ransom', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 254-273.
- Jones, M. K., 'Richard III and Lady Margaret Beaufort: A Re-assessment', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P.W., Hammond (London, 1986), pp. 25-37.
- Jones, M. K., 'Sir William Stanley of Holt: Politics and Family Allegiance in the Late Fifteenth Century', *The Welsh History Review*, No. 14 (1988), pp. 1-22.
- Jones, M. K., 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CCCXI (1989), pp. 285-307.
- Jones, M. K., and Underwood, M. G., 'Lady Margaret Beaufort, 1443-1509', *History Today*, Vol. XXXV (1985), pp. 23-30.
- Jones, M. K., and Underwood, M. G., *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Keen, M. H., *England in the Later Middle Ages: a Political History* (1973).
- Kekewick, M., 'The Attainder of the Yorkists in 1459: Two Contemporary Accounts', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LV (1982), pp. 25-34.
- Kelly, H. A., 'The Last Chroniclers of Croyland', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VII, No. 91 (1985), pp. 142-177.
- Kelly, H. A., 'Croyland Observations', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 108 (1990), pp. 334-341.
- Kendall, P. M., *Richard III* (London, 1955).
- Kendall, P. M., *Warwick the Kingmaker* (London, 1957).
- Kerr, P. W., 'The Leventhorpes of Sawbridgeworth', *Transactions of the East Hertfordshire Archaeological Society*, Vol. IX (1934-36), pp. 129-51.
- King, H. W., 'Ancient Wills', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, Vol. III, No. 3 (1864), pp. 75-94.
- King, H. W., 'Ancient Wills', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, Vol. IV, No. 9 (1869), pp. 1-24.
- King, H. W., 'Ancient Wills', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, Vol. I, No. 146 (1878), pp. 142-152.
- Kingsford, C. L., *English Historical Literature* (Oxford, 1913).
- Kingsford, C. L., *Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth Century England*, 2nd ed. (London, 1962).

- Kirke, H., 'Sir Henry Vernon of Haddon', *Journal of the Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, No. 42 (1920), pp. 1-18.
- Knecht, R. J., 'The Episcopate and the Wars of The Roses', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, Vol. VI (1958), pp. 108-131.
- Lander, J. R., 'Edward IV: The Modern Legend: and a Revision', *History*, Vol. XLI (1955-6), pp. 38-52.
- Lander, J. R., 'Council, Administration and Councillors, 1461-1485', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXII (1959), pp. 138-80.
- Lander, J. R., 'Henry VI and the Duke of York's Second Protectorate, 1455 to 1456', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. XLIII (1960-1), pp. 46-69.
- Lander, J. A., 'Attainder and Forfeiture, 1453 - 1509', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1961), pp.119-51.
- Lander, J. A., 'Marriage and Politics in the Fifteenth Century: the Nevilles and the Wydevilles', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXVI (1963), pp. 119-152.
- Lander, J. R., 'The Treason and Death of the Duke of Clarence: A Re-Interpretation', *Canadian Journal of History*, Vol. II (1967), pp. 1-28.
- Lander, J. R., *Conflict and Stability in Fifteenth-century England* (London, 1969).
- Lander, J. R., 'Family, "Friends" and Politics in Fifteenth-century England', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 27-40.
- Lander, J. R., *English Justices of the Peace, 1461-1509* (Gloucester, 1989).
- Langston, J. N., 'Priors of Lanthony by Gloucester', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, Vol. LXIII (1942), pp. 1-143.
- Lapsley, 'Buzones', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XLVII (1932), pp. 177-193 and 545-567.
- Latham, L. C., 'The Collection of the Wages of Knights of the Shire in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth centuries', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XLVIII (1933), pp. 455-464.
- Leadam, I. S., 'An Unknown Conspiracy against King Henry VII', *T.R.H.S.*, Vol. XVI (1902), pp. 133-151.
- Levine, M., 'Richard III - Usurper or Lawful King?', *Speculum*, Vol. XXXIV (1959), pp. 391-401.
- Levine, M., *Tudor England 1485-1603* (Cambridge, 1968).
- Lewis, N. B., 'Indentures of Retinue with John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, enrolled in Chancery 1367-99', *Camden Miscellany*, Vol. XXII, Camden Society, Fourth Series, Vol. I (1964).
- Lindsay, P., *King Richard III* (London, 1933), 2nd ed., 1969.
- Lingard, J., *The History of England, from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in 1688*, Vol. IV (London, 1855).
- Loades, D. M., *Politics and the Nation 1450-1660* (London, 1974).

- Lovatt, R., 'A Collector of Apocryphal Anecdotes: John Blacman Revisited', *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, ed. A. J. Pollard (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 172-197.
- Lowe, D. E., 'The Council of the Prince of Wales and the Decline of the Herbert Family during the Second Reign of Edward IV (1471-1483)', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, Vol. XXVII (1977), pp. 278-297.
- Lowe, D. E., 'Patronage and Politics: Edward IV, the Wydevills and the council of the Prince of Wales, 1471-83', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, Vol. XXIX (1981), pp. 545-73.
- MacCulloch, D., 'War and Glory under a Young King: The Howards, Rivals in Power', *Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties*, ed. D. Starkey (London, 1990), pp. 26-37.
- MacDougall, N., 'Richard III and James III, Contemporary Monarchs, Parallel Mythologies', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 148-171.
- Maclean, J., 'Manor of Tockington, co. Gloucester', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, Vol. XII (1887), pp. 123-55.
- MacNamara, F. N., *Memorials of the Danvers Family* (London, 1895).
- Maddicott, J. R., 'The County Community and the Making of Public Opinion in Fourteenth Century England', *T.R.H.S.*, Fifth Series, Vol. XXVIII (1978), pp. 27-43.
- Makinson, A., 'The Road to Bosworth Field, August 1485', *History Today*, Vol. XIII (1963), pp. 239-249.
- Marius, R., *Thomas More* (New York, 1985).
- Markham, C. L., 'Richard III: A Doubtful Verdict Reviewed', *E.H.R.*, Vol. VI (1891), pp. 250-83.
- Markham, C. L., *Richard III: His Life and Character* (New York, 1906).
- Massey, R., 'The Land Settlement of Lancastrian Normandy', *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, ed. A. J. Pollard (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 76-96.
- Maurer, H., 'The Later Careers of William Herbert, Earl of Huntingdon, and his brother Sir Walter Herbert', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 95-100.
- Maurer, H., 'Bones in the Tower: A Discussion of the Time, Place and Circumstance Part 1', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 111 (December, 1990), pp. 474-493.
- McFarlane, K. B., 'Bastard Feudalism', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XX (1943-5), pp. 161-180.
- McFarlane, K. B., 'Parliament and Bastard Feudalism', *T.R.H.S.*, Fourth Series, Vol. XXVI (1944), pp. 53-79.
- McFarlane, K. B., 'England: The Lancastrian Kings, 1399-1461', *The Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. C.W. Previte-Orton and Z.N. Brooke, Vol. VIII (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 363-417.

- McFarlane, K. B., 'The Wars of the Roses', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. L (1964), pp. 87-119.
- McFarlane, K. B., *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights* (Oxford, 1972).
- McFarlane, K. B., *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (London, 1973).
- McFarlane, K. B., *England in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1981).
- Meredith, R., 'The Eyres of Hassop, 1470-1640', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, Vol. LXXXIV (1964), pp. 1-51.
- Mills, M. H., 'The Collectors of the Customs', *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, ed. W. A. Morris and J. R. Strayer, The Medieval Academy of America, Vol. II (Massachusetts, 1947).
- Mingay, G. E., *The Gentry, The Rise and Fall of a Ruling Class* (London, 1976).
- Moir, E., *The Justices of the Peace* (Harmondsworth, 1969).
- Moreton, C. E., 'A Local Dispute and the Politics of 1483: Roger Townshend, Earl Rivers and the Duke of Gloucester', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 107 (1989), pp. 305-07.
- Moreton, C. E., 'A Social Gulf? The Upper and Lesser Gentry of Later Medieval England', *Journal of Medieval History*, Vol. XVII, No.3 (1991), pp. 255-262.
- Morgan, D. A. L., 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', *R.H.S.T.*, Fifth Series, Vol. XXIII(London, 1973), pp. 1-25.
- Morgan, D. A. L., 'The house of policy: the political role of the late Plantagenet household, 1422-1485', *The English at Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. D. Starkey (London, 1987), pp. 25-70.
- Morris, W. A., 'The Sheriff', *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336*, ed. W. A. Morris and J. R. Strayer, The Medieval Academy of America, Vol. II (1947), pp. 41-108.
- Myers, A. R., 'The Character of Richard III', originally published in *History Today*, Vol. IV(1954), reprinted in *English Society and Government in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. C.M.D. Crowder (London, 1967).
- Myers, A. R., *The Household of Edward IV* (Manchester, 1959).
- Myers, A. R., *England in the Late Middle Ages*, 2nd. ed. (1963).
- Myers, A. R., 'Richard III and Historical Tradition', *History*, Vol. LIII (1968), pp. 181-202.
- Myers, J. G. N., 'Memorials of the Family of Cobham', *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogia*, Vol. VII (1841), pp. 320-54.
- Mynors, H. C. B., 'Sir Roger Mynors of Duffield', *Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, No. 73 (1953), pp. 112-13.
- New Perspectives in Historical Writing*, ed. P. Burke(Cambridge, 1991).
- Newton, A. R., 'The King's Chamber under the Early Tudors', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XXXII (1917), pp. 348-72.
- Oliver, G., *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter and A History of the Cathedral*, ed. W. Roberts (Exeter, 1861).

- Orme, N., 'The Education of Edward V', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LVII (1984), pp. 119-130.
- Ormerod, G., 'A memoir on the Lancashire House of Le Noreis of Norres', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, No. 2 (1850), pp. 138-82.
- Ormrod, W. M., *The Reign of Edward III: Crown and Political Society in England 1327-1377* (New Haven, 1990).
- Otway-Ruthven, J., *The King's Secretary and the Signet-Office in the XV Century* (Cambridge, 1939).
- Palliser, D., 'Richard III and York', *Richard III and the North*, ed. R. Horrox, Studies in Regional and Local History, No. 6, University of Hull (1986), pp.51-81.
- Parry, G. J. R., 'John Stow's Unpublished Historie', *E. H. R.*, Vol. CII, No.402 (1987), pp. 633-647.
- Paton, D.M., *The 1483 Gloucester Charter in History* (Gloucester, 1983).
- Payling, S. J., 'The Ampthill Dispute: a Study in Aristocratic Lawlessness and the Breakdown of Lancastrian Government', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CIV(1989), pp. 880-906.
- Pelicier, P., *Essai sur le Gouvernement de la Dame de Beaujeu, 1483-1491* (Chatres, 1882).
- Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, B. A., *Francois II, Duc de Bretagne et L'Angleterre, 1458-88* (Paris, 1929).
- Pollard, A. F., 'The Making of Sir Thomas More's Richard III', *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed. J.G. Edwards (Manchester, 1933).
- Pollard, A. F., 'Sir Thomas More's "Richard III"', *History*, Vol. XVII (1933), pp. 317-323.
- Pollard, A. J., 'The Northern Retainers of Richard Nevill, Earl of Salisbury', *Northern History*, Vol. XI (1975), pp. 52-79.
- Pollard, A. J., 'The Tyranny of Richard III', *Journal of Medieval History*, Vol. III (1977), pp. 147-165.
- Pollard, A. J., 'The Richmondshire Community of Gentry during the Wars of The Roses', *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, ed. C. Ross (Gloucester, 1979), pp. 37-59.
- Pollard, A. J., 'North, South and Richard III', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 349-358.
- Pollard, A. J., 'St Cuthbert and the Hog: Richard III and the County Palatine of Durham, 1471-85', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 109-29.
- Pollard, A. J., *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1988).
- Pollard, A. J., *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower* (Gloucester, 1991).
- Potter, J., *Good King Richard? An Account of Richard III and his Reputation 1483-1983* (London, 1988).
- Pugh. T. B., "'An Indenture for the Marches', Between Henry VII and Edward Stafford (1477-1521), Duke of Buckingham", *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXI (1956), pp. 436-41.

- Pugh, T. B., *The Marcher Lordships of South Wales, 1416-1536* (Cardiff, 1963).
- Pugh, T. B., 'The Magnates, Knights and gentry', *Fifteenth Century England*, ed. S.B. Chrimes, C.D. Ross and R. A. Griffiths (Manchester, 1972), pp. 86-128.
- Pugh, T. B., 'The Southampton Plot of 1415', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 62-89.
- Pugh, T. B., 'Richard Plantagenet (1411-60), Duke of York, as the King's Lieutenant in France and Ireland', *Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society*, ed. J. G. Rowe (1986).
- Putnam, B. H., 'The Transformation of the Keepers of the Peace into the Justices of the Peace, 1327-1380', *T.R.H.S., Fourth Series*, Vol. XII (1929), pp. 19-48.
- Putnam, B. H., 'Shire Officials: Keepers of the Peace and Justices of the Peace', *English Government at Work 1327-1336*, 3 vols., ed. J.F. Willard et.al., The Medieval Academy of America (Massachusetts, 1950), Vol. III, pp. 185-217.
- Ramsay, J., *Lancaster and York*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1982).
- Ramsay, N. L., 'What was the Legal Profession?', *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England*, ed. M. Hicks (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 62-71.
- Ransome, M., 'Some Recent Studies of the Composition of the House of Commons', *Birmingham University Historical Journal*, Vol. VI (1957-8), pp. 132-148.
- Rapin-Thoyras, P. de, *History of England*, ed. J.S.P. Knapton, Vol. VI (London, 1687).
- Rawcliffe, C., *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham 1394-1521* (Cambridge, 1977).
- Rawcliffe, C., 'Henry VII and Edward, Duke of Buckingham: the Repression of an "Overmighty Subject"', *B.I.H.R.*, No. 53 (1980), pp. 114-118.
- Rawcliffe, C., Flower, S., 'Noblemen and their Advisors', *Journal of British Studies* (1986), pp. 157-77.
- Rawcliffe, C., 'Consultants, Careerists and Conspirators: Royal Doctors in the Time of Richard III', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 106 (1989) pp. 250-58.
- Rees, D., *The Son of Prophecy: Henry Tudor's Road to Bosworth* (1985).
- Reeves, A. C., 'Some of Humphrey Stafford's Military Indentures', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, Vol. XVI (1972), pp. 80-91.
- Richard III and the City of York*, ed. R. Freeman, E. White, York City Archives (1983).
- Richmond, C. F., 'Fauconberg's Kentish rising of May 1471', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXV (1970), pp. 673-692.
- Richmond, C. F., *John Hopton: A Fifteenth Century Gentleman* (Cambridge, 1981).
- Richmond, C. F., 'After McFarlane', *History: The Journal of the Historical Association*, Vol. LXVIII, No. 222 (Portsmouth, 1983), pp. 46-60.
- Richmond, C. F., 'The Battle of Bosworth, August 1485', *History Today*, Vol. XXXV (1985), pp. 17-22.

- Richmond, C. F., 'The Pastons Revisited: Marriage and Family in Fifteenth-Century England', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LVIII (1985), pp. 25-36.
- Richmond, C. F., '1485 And All That, or what was going on at the Battle of Bosworth?', *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (London, 1986), pp. 172-206.
- Richmond, C. F., 'The Sulyard Papers: The Rewards of a Small Family Archive', *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. D. Williams (Suffolk, 1987), pp. 199-228.
- Richmond, C. F., 'Notes and Documents: The Death of Edward V', *Northern History*, Vol. XXV (1989), pp. 278-280.
- Richmond, C. F., 'A Letter of 19 April 1483 from John Gigur to William Waynflete', *Historical Research*, Vol. LXV, No. 156 (1992), pp. 112-116.
- Robertson, C. A., 'Local Government and the King's "affinity" in Fifteenth-Century Leicestershire and Warwickshire', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society*, Vol. LII (1976-77), pp. 37-45.
- Robinson, C., *A History of the Castles of Herefordshire and their Lords* (London, 1869).
- Robinson, J. M., *The Dukes of Norfolk* (Oxford, 1982).
- Roffe, D., 'Domesday Book and Northern Society: a reassessment', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CV (1990), pp. 310-336.
- Rogers, A., 'Parliamentary electors in Lincolnshire in the fifteenth century' part 1, *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology*, Vol. III (1968), pp. 41-79.
- Rosenthal, J. T., 'Sir Richard Choke (d. 1483) of Long Ashton', State University of New York at Stony Brook, pp. 105-121.
- Rosenthal, J. T., 'The Estates and Finances of Richard, Duke of York', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, Vol. II (1965), pp. 115-204.
- Rosenthal, J. T., 'Feuds and Private Peace-Making: Fifteenth-Century Example', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, Vol. XIV (1970), pp. 84-90.
- Rosenthal, J. T., *Nobles and the Noble Life 1295-1500* (London, 1976).
- Roskell, J. S., 'The Social Composition of the Commons in a Fifteenth-Century Parliament', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXIV (1951), pp. 152-172.
- Roskell, J. S., 'The Office and Dignity of Protector of England, with special reference to its origins', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXVIII (1953), pp. 193-233.
- Roskell, J. S., 'Sir John Wood of Molesey, Speaker in the Parliament of 1483', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, Vol. LVI (1959), pp. 15-28.
- Roskell, J. S., 'William Catesby, counsellor to Richard III', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XLII (1959-60), pp. 145-174.
- Roskell, J. S., 'Sir Richard Vernon of Haddon', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, Vol. LXXXII (1962), pp. 43-63.

- Roskell, J. S., *The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments 1376-1523* (Manchester, 1965).
- Roskell, J. S., *Parliament and Politics in Late Medieval England*, 3 vols (London, 1981-3).
- Ross, C. D., 'The Estates and Finances of Richard, Duke of York', *Welsh History Review*, Vol. III (1967), pp. 299-302.
- Ross, C.D., 'The Reign of Edward IV', *Fifteenth Century England: 1399-1509*, ed. S. B. Chrimes, C. D. Ross, R. A. Griffiths (Manchester, 1972), pp. 49-66.
- Ross, C., *Edward IV* (London, 1974).
- Ross, C., *The Wars of The Roses* (London, 1976).
- Ross, C., *Richard III* (London, 1981).
- Rowney, I. D., 'The Staffordshire Political Community 1440-1500', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Keele, 1981.
- Rowney, I. D., 'The Hastings Affinity in Staffordshire and the Honour of Tutbury', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LVII (1984), pp. 35-45.
- Rowney, I. D., 'Resources and Retaining in Yorkist England: William, Lord Hastings and the Honour of Tutbury', *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, ed. A. J. Pollard (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 139-155.
- Rowse, A. L., 'The Duchy of Cornwall', *The Nineteenth Century* (1937), pp. 43-56.
- Rowse, A. L., 'The Turbulent Career of Sir Henry de Bodrugan', *History*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 109 (1944), pp. 17-26.
- Rowse, A. L., *Bosworth Field and the Wars of the Roses* (London, 1966).
- Rowse, A. L., *Tudor Cornwall*, 2nd ed. (London, 1969).
- Salzman, L. F., 'Sussex Domesday Tenants IV: The Family of Chesney or Cheyney', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, Vol. LXV (1924), pp. 20-54.
- Saul, N., *Scenes From Provincial Life: Knightly Families in Sussex 1280-1400* (Oxford, 1986).
- Sayer, M., 'Norfolk Involvement in Dynastic Conflict 1467-1471 and 1483-1487', *Norfolk Archaeology*, Vol. XXXVI (1977), pp. 305-326.
- Schofield, R. H., 'The Geographical Distribution of Wealth in England, 1334-1649', *Economic History Review*, Second Series, Vol. XVIII (1965), pp. 483-510.
- Schofield, C. L., 'The Early Life of John de Vere, thirteenth Earl of Oxford', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIX (1914), pp. 228-245.
- Schofield, C. L., *The Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth*, 2 vols (London, 1923).
- Seward, D., *Richard III: England's Black Legend* (Northampton, 1983).
- Shaw, W. A., *The Knights of England*, 2 vols (London, 1906).
- Sillem, R., 'Commissions of the Peace, 1380-1485', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. X (1932-33), pp. 81-104.
- Simpson, W. D., '"Bastard Feudalism" and the Later Castles', *Antiquaries Journal*, Vol. XXVI (1946), pp. 145-71.

- Smith, A., 'Litigation and Politics: Sir John Fastolf's defence of his English property', *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History*, ed. A. J. Pollard (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 59-75.
- Smith, J. B., 'Crown and Community in the Principality of North Wales in the Reign of Henry Tudor', *Welsh History Review*, Vol. III (1966-7), pp. 145-71.
- Smyth, J., *The Berkeley Manuscripts: Lives of the Berkeleys, 1618-1628*, ed. J. Maclean, 3 vols (Gloucester, 1883-5).
- Somerville, R., 'Henry VII's "Council Learned in the Law"', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XLIV (1939), pp. 427-442.
- Somerville, R., *History of the Duchy of Lancaster* (London, 1953).
- Starkey, D., 'The Age of the Household: Politics, Society and the Arts c. 1350-c. 1550', *The Context of English Literature: The Later Middle Ages*, ed. S. Metcalf (London, 1981), pp. 226-89.
- Starkey, D., 'From Feud to Faction: English politics circa 1450-1550', *History Today*, Vol. XXXII (1982), pp. 16-22.
- Starkey, D., 'Rivals in Power: The Tudors and the Nobility', *Rivals in Power: Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties*, ed. D. Starkey (London, 1990), pp. 8-25.
- St Aubyn, G., *The Year of Three Kings* (London, 1983).
- Stevenson, E. R., 'The Escheator', *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, Vol. 2, ed. W.A. Morris, J.R. Strayer, *The Medieval Academy of America* (Massachusetts, 1947).
- Storey, R. L., 'Notes and Documents: English Officers of State, 1399-1485', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXI (1958), pp. 84-93.
- Storey, R. L., 'Lincolnshire and the Wars of the Roses', *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies*, Vol. XIV (1970), pp. 64-83.
- Storey, R. L., 'Gentlemen-bureaucrats', *Profession, Vocation and Culture in Later Medieval England, Essays Dedicated to the Memory of A.R. Myers*, ed. C.H. Clough (Liverpool, 1982), pp. 90-129.
- Storey, R. L., *The End of the House of Lancaster*, revised ed (Gloucester, 1986).
- Storey, R. L., 'The Universities During the Wars of the Roses', *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. D. Williams (Suffolk, 1987), pp. 315-328.
- Sutton, A. F., 'Richard III's secretary: the search continued', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 75 (1981), pp. 438-47.
- Sutton, A. F., 'George Lovekyn, Tailor to Three Kings of England, 1470-1504', *Costume* (1981), pp. 1-12.
- Sutton, A. F., 'The Hautes of Kent', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 77 (1982), pp. 54-5.
- Sutton, A. F., 'Richard III's "tytulle & right": A new discovery', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 57-63.

- Sutton, A. F., 'Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Battle of Barnet', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 258-259.
- Sutton, A. F., 'Richard III, the City of London and Southwark', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 289-295.
- Sutton, A. F., "'A Curious Searcher for our Weal Public': Richard III, Piety, Chivalry and the Concept of the 'Good Prince'", *Richard III: Loyalty, Lordship and Law*, ed. P. W. Hammond (Gloucester, 1986), pp.58-90.
- Sutton, A. F., 'William Shore, merchant of London and Derby', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, No. 106 (1986), pp. 127-39.
- Sutton, A. F., and Visser-Fuchs, L., 'The Prophecy of G', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 110 (1990), pp. 449-50.
- Sutton, A. F., and Visser-Fuchs, L., 'Richard III's Books: IX . The Grandes Chroniques de France', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 3 (1990), pp. 494-514.
- The Complete Peerage*, ed. V. Gibbs, H.A. Doubleday etc. 13 vols (London, 1910-40).
- The Medical Practitioners in Medieval England, A Biographical Register*, ed. C. H. Talbot, E. A. Hammond (London, 1965).
- The Place Names of Berkshire*, M. Gelling, English Place-Name Society, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1973).
- The Place Names of Devon*, J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, English Place-Name Society, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1931).
- The Place Names of Dorset*, A. D. Mills, English Place-Name Society, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1977).
- The Place Names of Gloucestershire*, A. H. Smith, English Place-Name Society, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1964).
- The Place Names of Oxfordshire*, M. Gelling, English Place-Name Society, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1954).
- The Place Names of Surrey*, J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, English Place-Name Society (Cambridge, 1934).
- The Place Names of Sussex*, A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, English Place-Name Society, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1930).
- The Place Names of Wiltshire*, J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, English Place-Name Society (Cambridge, 1939).
- The Victoria History of the County of Berkshire.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Cornwall.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Devon.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Dorset.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Essex.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Gloucestershire.*

- The Victoria History of the County of Herefordshire.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Kent.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Middlesex.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Oxfordshire.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Shropshire.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Somerset.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Surrey.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Sussex.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Wiltshire.*
- The Victoria History of the County of Worcestershire.*
- The Visitations of the County of Cornwall, Comprising the Heralds' Visitations of 1530, 1573, & 1620*, ed. J. I. Vivian (Exeter, 1887).
- The Visitation of the County of Devon in the Year 1620*, ed. F.T. Colby (London, 1872).
- Thompson, H. L., 'The Poyntz Family', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, Vol. IV (1879-80), pp. 73-85.
- Thomson, J. A. F., '"The Arrivall of Edward IV" - The Development of the Text', *Speculum*, Vol. XLVI (1971), pp. 84-93.
- Thomson, J. A. F., 'The Courtenay Family in the Yorkist Period', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XIV (1972), pp. 230-246.
- Thomson, J. A. F., 'Richard III and lord Hastings - a problematical case reviewed', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XLVIII (1975), pp. 22-30.
- Thomson, J. A. F., 'John de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk', *Speculum*, Vol. LIV (1979), pp. 528-42.
- Thomson, J. A. F., *The Transformation of Medieval England, 1370-1529* (London, 1983).
- Thomson, J. A. F., 'Bishop Lionel Woodville and Richard III', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. LIX (1986), pp. 130-135.
- Thomson, J. A. F., 'The Death of Edward V: Dr Richmond's Dating Reconsidered', *Northern History*, Vol. XXVI (1990,) pp. 207-211.
- Thornhill, J., *The History of Wem* (Shrewsbury, 1982).
- Thrupp, S., *The Merchant Class of Medieval London 1300-1500* (Chicago 1948).
- Tuck, J. A., 'The Emergence of a Northern Nobility, 1250-1400', *Northern History*, Vol. XXII (1986), pp. 1-17.
- Tucker, M. J., 'The Life of Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey and Second Duke of Norfolk, 1443-1524', Ph. D., Northwestern University (1962), authorized facsimile by University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor (Michigan, 1985).
- Tucker, N., 'Bodrhyddan and the families of Conwy, Shipley-Conwy and Rowley-Conwy', *Flintshire Historical Society Publications*, Vol. XIX (1961), pp. 61-86.
- Tudor-Craig, P., *Richard III* (Ipswich, 1973).

- Tudor-Craig, P., 'Richard III's Triumphant Entry into York', *Richard III and the North*, ed. R. Horrox, Studies in Regional and Local History No. 6, University of Hull (1986), pp.108-116.
- Tudor-Craig, P., 'The Hours of Edward V and William Lord Hastings: British Library Manuscript Additional 54782', *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. D. Williams (Suffolk, 1987), pp. 351-370.
- Turner, S., *The History of England during the Middle Ages*, Book III (London, 1825).
- Vernon-Harcourt, L. W., *His Grace the Steward and the Trial of Peers* (London, 1907).
- Virgoe, R., 'Three Suffolk Parliamentary Elections of the Mid-fifteenth Century', *B.I.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIX (1966), pp. 185-196.
- Virgoe, R., 'The Recovery of the Howards in East Anglia, 1485-1529', *Wealth and Power in Tudor England*, Essays Presented to S. T. Bindoff, E. W. Ives, R. J. Knecht, and J. J. Scarisbrick (London, 1978) pp. 1-20.
- Virgoe, R., 'The Crown, Magnates and Local Government in Fifteenth-Century East Anglia', *The Crown and Local Communities in England and France in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. R. L. Highfield and R. Jeffs (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 72-87.
- Virgoe, R., 'Sir John Risley 1443-1512: Courtier and Councillor', *Norfolk Archaeology*, Vol. XXXVIII (1982), pp. 140-148.
- Virgoe, R., 'An Election Dispute of 1483', *Historical Research*, Vol. LX (1987), pp. 24-44.
- Virgoe, R., 'Aspects of the County Community in the Fifteenth Century', *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England*, ed. M. Hicks (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 1-13.
- Waller, J. G., 'The Lords of Cobham, their Monuments and their Church', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, Vol. XI (1877), pp. 49-112;
- Waller, J. G., 'The Lords of Cobham, their Monuments and their Church', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, Vol. XII (1878), pp. 113-66.
- Walpole, H., *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* (London, 1768), second ed(Yorkshire, 1974).
- Warnicke, R.M., 'Sir Ralph Bigod: a loyal servant to king Richard III', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VI, No. 84 (1984) pp. 299-303.
- Waters, G., 'Morton Connections in Gloucestershire', *The Ricardian*, Vol. III, No. 46 (1974), pp. 17-18.
- Waters, G., *King Richard's Gloucester : Life in a Medieval Town* (Gloucester, 1983).
- Waters, G., 'The Gloucester Scene - August 1483', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 239-244.
- Waters, G., 'William, Lord Berkeley', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 69-78.
- Watts, J. L., 'The Counsels of King Henry VI, c. 1435-1445', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CVI (1991), pp. 279-298.

- Webster, W., 'An Unknown Treaty between Edward IV and Louis XI', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XII (1897), pp. 521-22.
- Wedgwood, J. C., 'Harcourt of Ellenhall', *Collections for a History of Staffordshire*, ed. William Salt Archaeological Society (1914), pp. 185-210.
- Wedgwood, J. C., *History of Parliament : Biographies of the Members of the Commons House 1439-1509*, H.M.S.O. (London, 1936).
- Wedgwood, J. C., *History of Parliament: Register of the Ministers and of the Members of both Houses*, H.M.S.O. (London, 1938).
- Weightman, C., *Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy 1446-1503* (Gloucester, 1989).
- Weiss, M., 'A Power in the North? The Percies in the Fifteenth Century', *Historical Journal*, Vol. XIX (1976), pp. 501-9.
- Wesley, J., *A Concise History of England - From the Earliest Times to the Death of George II*, Vol. II (London, 1776).
- Westcote, T., *A View of Devonshire in 1630 with a Pedigree of most of its Gentry*, ed. W. Roberts (Exeter, 1845).
- Wilkinson, B., *Constitutional History of England in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1964).
- Williams, B., 'The Mystery of Richard de la Pole', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 88 (1985), pp. 18-25.
- Williams, B., 'Richard III and the House of Dudley', *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 108 (1990), pp. 346-350.
- Williams, C. H., 'A Norfolk Parliamentary Election, 1461', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XL (1925), pp. 79-86.
- Williams, C. H., 'The Rebellion of Humphrey Stafford in 1486', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XXXIII (1928), pp. 181-189.
- Williams, C. H., 'England: The Yorkist Kings, 1461-1485', *The Cambridge Medieval History: The Close of the Middle Ages*, Vol. VIII (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 418-4.
- Williams, D., 'The Crowland Chronicle, 616-1500', *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. D. Williams (Suffolk, 1987), pp. 371-390.
- Williams, D. T., *The Battle of Bosworth* (Leicester, 1973).
- Williams, J. M., 'The Political Career of Francis Viscount Lovell (1456 -?), *The Ricardian*, Vol. VIII, No. 109 (1990), pp. 382-402.
- Williams, N. J., *Thomas Howard, Fourth Duke of Norfolk* (1964).
- Williams, P., 'English Politics after Bosworth', *History Today*, Vol. XXXV (1985), pp. 30-3.
- Wingfield, J. M., *Some Records of the Wingfield Family* (London, 1925).
- Wiseman, T. P., Elton, G. R., Russell, C., Hutton, R., Turner, J., Morgan, K. O., Foster, R. F., and Clarke, P., 'What is Political History?', *History Today*, Vol. XXXV (1985), pp. 10-18.
- Wolffe, B. P., 'The Management of English Royal Estates under Yorkist Kings', *E.H.R.*, Vol. CCLXXVIII (1956), pp. 1-27.

- Wolffe, B. P., 'Henry VII's Land Revenues and Chamber Finance', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXIX (1964), pp. 225-254.
- Wolffe, B. P., *The Crown Lands 1461-1536: an aspect of Yorkist and early Tudor government* (London, 1970).
- Wolffe, B. P., *The Royal Demesne in English History* (London, 1971).
- Wolffe, B. P., 'When and Why did Hastings lose his Head?', *E.H.R.*, Vol. LXXXIX (1974), pp. 835-844.
- Wolffe, B. P., 'Hastings Reinterred', *E.H.R.*, Vol. XCI (1976), pp. 813-824.
- Wolffe, B. P., *Henry VI* (London, 1981).
- Wood, C. T., 'The Deposition of Edward V', *Traditio*, Vol. 31 (1975), pp. 247-286.
- Wood, C. T., 'Richard III, William, Lord Hastings and Friday the Thirteenth', *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. R. A. Griffiths and J. Sherborne (New York, 1986), pp. 225-254.
- Wood, C. T., Ross, C., and Sutton, A. F., 'Richard III's "tytylle & right": correspondence', *Richard III: Crown and People*, ed. J. Petre (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 64-65.
- Woodhouse, R. I., *The Life of John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury* (1895).
- Worth, R. N., *A History of Devonshire* (London, 1886).
- Wright, S. M., *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century* (Chesterfield, 1983).
- Yeatman, J. P., *The Early History of the House of Arundel* (London, 1882).